

Mm Minnes

11.29.05.

From the Library of

Professor Samuel Misser

in Memory of

Judge Samuel Misser Breckinridge

Presented by

Samuel Misser Breckinridge Long

to the Library of

Princeton Theological Seminary

COLLECTION OF PURITAN AND ENGLISH THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE



PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

Mary land and a supplement of

r of the first of the all

hall the second of a final line of the SHARL SHOULD BE WAS A STANFARD In their I'm mention proved beset in each continue to the second to the second to the the mark share a firm the share agree shall be a and the state of the transfer of the state o And the state of t ET SET TOWNS CONTRACT TO SET TO Planting of a replace that the grown who we want and the same of th all and the wine field the air a stable aligh

promoted in the modern of

## Die Lunæ 24. January 1647.

THE FOREST CONTRACTORS

Rdered by the Lords in Parliament assembled, That Master Adoniram Byseild, one of the Scribes of the Affembly, do take special care in the printing of these things following; And that no other shall presume to print the same, viz. The Reafons of the Dissenting Brethren against the third Proposition concerning Presbyterial Government, And the Answer of the Assembly to those Reasons, as well those formerly printed for the use of the Houses, as any other Reasons and Answers never formerly printed: As also the Papers and Answers of the Dissenting Brethren, and the Committee of the Assembly put into the Committee of Lords and Commons and Assembly of Divines for Accommodation. And that none shall presume to print or reprint any of the particulars above recited, but such as shall be thereunto appointed by the said Adoniram Byfeild, as they will answer the contrary at their perill.

#### John Browne Cler. Parliamentorum.

I do appoint Humphrey Harward, and no other person to print the Reasons, Answers, and Papers above mentioned.

Adoniram Byfield Scriba.

\$150 1818.

THE Sam diller.

## REASONS

Presented by the

Dissenting Brethren

AGAINST CERTAIN

## PROPOSITIONS

CONCERNING

# Presbyteriall GOVERNMENT.

And the Proofs of them Voted by the Assembly of Divines, sitting by authority of Parliament, at Westminster.

Together with the Answer of the Assembly of Divines to those Reasons of Dissent.

#### LONDON,

Printed by T. R. and E. M. for Humphrey Harward, and are to be fold at his Shop at the George on Ludgate hill over against Bell-Savage. 1648,

The Names of the Dissenting Brethren

Thomas Goodwine

Philip Ney

Jeremich Burroughs

Sidrach Sympson

Milliam Bridge

Milliam Greenhill and

Milliam Contern



Die Jovis 3. Febr. 1647.

Rdered by the Lords in Parliament Assembled, That Mr. Thomas Goodwin and Mr. Whitaker, shall have the oversight and perusall of such Papers and Writings as Mr. By field hath order to Print; And that the said Mr. Goodwin and Mr. Whitaker have free liberty to peruse the Originals of the said Papers and Writings before they go to the Presse.

Joh. Brown Cler. Parliamentorum.

The Papers and Writings above mentioned have been examined and peruled, this we tellifie.

THO. GOODWIN.
JER. WHITAKER.

### damaradama adadaman.

THE Diffenting Brethren entred their Diffent with Reasons in writing to be presented to the Honourable Houses by the Assembly, onely to these Propositions. Viz.

1. The third Proposition concerning Presbyteriall Government.

2. The Propositions concerning the Subordination of

Assemblies:

3. The Proposition concerning the power of Ordination, whether in a particular Congregation, though it may associate.

(A) 3 The

## The third Proposition concerning

Presbyteriall Government, as it was Voted in the Assembly and sent up to both the Honourable Houses of Parliament.



He Scripture doth hold forth that many particular Congregations may be under one Presbyteriall Government.

This Proposition is proved by instances. .

I. Instance, Of the Church of Jerusalem, which consisted of more Congregations then one, and all those

Congregations were under one Presbyteriall Government.

This appeareth, thus,

I. The Church of ferufalem consisted of more Congregations then one, as is manifest.

I. By the multitude of Beleevers, mentioned in divers texts col-

lated:

Both before the dispersion of the Beleevers there, by meanes of the persecution (mentioned in the Asts-of the Apostles, chap. 8. in the beginning thereof) withesse Acts ch. I.v.11. and ch. 2. v 41.46. 47. and ch. 4.v.4. and ch. 5. v. 14. and ch. 6. v. I.7.

And also after the dispersion, Acts ch. 9.v. 31. and ch. 12. v 24.

and ch. 21. v. 20.

2. By the many Apostles and other Preachers in the Church of Jerusalem. If there were but one Congregation there, then each Apostle preached but seldome, which will not consist with Acts ch. c. v. 2.

3. The diversity of languages among st the Beleevers, mentioned both in the second and sixt chapters of the Acts, doth argue more Congre-

gations then one in that Church.

II. All those Congregations were under one Presbyterial Govern-

ment, Because,
1. They were one Church, Att. ch. 8. v. 1. and ch. 2. v. 47. com-

pared mith ch 5. v. 11. ch. 12. v. 5. and ch 15. v. 4.

2. The Elders of that Church are mentioned Acts ch. 11. v. 30.

and ch. 15. v. 4 6. 22. and ch. 21. v. 17. 18.

3. The Apostles did the ordinary acts of Presbyters as Presbyters in that Church; which proveth a Presbyterial Church before the dispersion, Acts ch.6.

4. The

4. The severall Congregations in Jerusalem being one Church, the Elders of that Church are mentioned, as meeting together for acts of Government, Acts ch. 11. v. 30. and ch. 15. v. 4. 6. 22. and ch. 21. v. 17. 18. and so forwards; which proves that these severall Congregations were under one Presbyteriall Government.

And whether these Congregations were fixed or not fixed, in regard of officers or members, it is all one as to the truth of the Propo-

sition.

Nor doth there appeare any materiall difference betwixt the severall Congregations in Jerusalem, and the many Congregations now in the ordinary condition of the Church, as to the point of fixednesse in regard of officers or members.

Therefore the Scripture doth hold forth, that many Congregations

may be under one Presbyteriall Government.

II. Instance Of the Church of Ephesus; For,

1. That there were more Congregations then one in the Church of Ephesus, appeares by Acts ch. 20. v. 31. where is mention of Pauls continuance at Ephesus, in preaching for the space of three years; and Acts ch. 19. v. 18, 19, 20 where the especial esfect of the word is mentioned, and v. 10. and 17. of the same chapt, where is a distinction of Jewes and Greeks, and 1 Cor. ch. 16. v. 89. where is a reason of Pauls stay at Ephesus untill Pentecost, and v. 19. where is mention of a part: cular Church, in the house of Aquila and Priscillathen at Ephesus, as appeareth, ch. 18. v. 19. 24. 26. all which layed together do prove that the multitudes of Believers did make more Congregations then one in the Church of Ephesus.

2. That there were many Elders over these many Congregations

as one flock, appeareth, Acts ch. 20. v. 17.25. 28. 30. 36.

3. That those many Congregations were one Church, and that they were under one Presbyteriall Government, appeareth, Rev. ch. 2. the first six verses joyned with Acts ch. 20. 17.28.

Concordat cum originali.

Adoniram Byfield Scriba.

The Propositions concerning the Subordination of Affemblies as they were Voted in the Assembly of Divines.

SYnodicall Assemblies, may lawfully be of severall sorts, as Provinciall, Nationall, and Occumenicall.

2. It is lawfull and agreeable to the word of God that there be a subordination of Congregationall, Classicall, Provinciall and Nationall Assemblies for the Government of the Church.

Proof of it,

Math. chap. 18. holding forth the subordination of an offending Brother to a particular Church, it doth also by a parity of Reason hold forth the subordination of a Congregation to superiour Assemblies.

3. In the severall sorts of Assemblies for the Government of the Church, it is lawfull and agreeable to the word of God that Appeals may be from

the inferiour to the superiour respectively.

The proofe brought for the subordination of Assemblies, proves the

lamfulnesse of Appeals from the inferiour to the superiour.

It is agreeable to the light of nature, that he who is wronged and deprived of his right by one power, should have recourse to another power, which may restore unto him his Right againe, and rescind the sentence whereby he was wronged; else there would be no powerfull remedy provided to remove wrong and to preserve Right.

The Proposition concerning Ordination, as it was voted in the Assembly of Divines.

It is very requisite that no single Congregation that can conveniently

Associate, do assume to it selfe all and sole power in Ordination.

I. Because there is no example in Scripture, that any single Congregation Which might conveniently associate, did assume to it selfe all and sole power in ordination; neither is there any rule which may warrant such a practice.

2. Because there is in Scripture, example of an Ordination in a Presbytery over divers Congregations; as in the Church of Jerusalem, where were many Congregations; these many Congregations were

under one Presbytery, and this Presbytery did ordain.

#### Concordat cum Originali. ADONIRAM BYFIELD Scriba.

To the first of these. 1. The Dissenting Brethren gave in after the debate Reasons against the Proposition it selfe. 2. Against the proofs of the Proposition. 1. From the instance of the Church of fernsalem. 2. Of Ephesus, in this Order as followeth.

Rea-



# REASONS against the Third Proposition, concerning Presbyterial Government, and the Principles thereof: viz.

The Scripture holds forth, That many particular Congregations may be under one Presbyteriall Government.

Humbly presented.

If many Congregations having all Elders already affixed respectively unto them may be under a Presbyteriall Government: Then all those Elders must sustaine a speciall relation of Elders to all the people of those Congregations as one Church, and

to every one as a Member thereof.

But for a company of such Elders already affixed, &c. to sustaine such a relation, carries with it so great and manifold incongruities, and inconsistencies, with what the Scripture speaks of Elders in their relation to a Church committed to them, and likewise with the Principles of the Reformed Churches themselves, as cannot be admitted.

And therefore such a Government may not be.

## The first Proposition.

Hat according to the Scriptures, such a Presbyteriall Government necessarily drawes such a speciall relation, is evinced by parts thus.

1. They must have the relation of Elders to all and every one of the Members; for Church and Elders are Relative. And the Argument for the Presbyteriall government is taken by the Presbyteriall Divines from this, That many Congregations in

Scripture, are made one Church, and the Elders thereof Elders of that Church.

2. That relation they have, must be a more speciall relation, as is evident from the practise and principles of this Government. For when the Congregations in Shires are divided into severall Presbyteries or Deanries, the Elders (though Neighbours) of a bordering Presbyterie, intermeddle not with the Congregations under another Presbyterie, and yet Neighbour Elders. It is

I.

therefore a special relation puts the difference, that those of these Presbyteries do judge the Congregations under them, as having a special relation to them, such as not to other Congregations.

#### The minor Proposition.

For the proof of which, we present these incongruities as follow. First, this breeds many incongruous disproportions to the Order set by Christ.

rint, this offers many incongruous aiproportions to the Order let by Christ,

about the Officers of the Church.

1. To extend a Pastors power of ordinary ruling beyond the extent of his ordinary teaching, is against the order which Christ hath set (and all extent of power must as well have an Institution of Christ, as the power or office it self, the difference of Evangelists and ordinary Pastors lay in extent of power) but the extent of a Pastors ordinary ruling power, is but to that Flock as his whole Flock which he is able to feed. The first Proposition is confirmed, first by Scripture; secondly, by Reason.

First, by Scripture, Act. 20. 28. Take heed to your selves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Chost hath made you Overseers to feed the flock of God, which he hath purchased with his own bloud. Whence first we see the special limitation of their extensive power and revelation [to a flock] & [All in that flock] is by the Holy Ghost, and not by man, and therefore is not to be extended by man, fur-

ther then the Holy Ghost hath appointed.

2. The extent of that relation to that flock, and the whole flock they feed, and to feed all that flock alike. And if they be preaching Elders, then to feed by preaching, and therefore are Overseers to them to feed them, and this because

they feed them.

3. He speaks to preaching Elders especially, that feed by doctrine: for he propounds his own example to them, v.20. That he had revealed the whole counfel of God. And Peter seconds Paul in this, I Pet.5.2. Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof. The flock en suiv among you: is that flock any of them had relation to as his flock respectively. Peter here writing unto the Churches in severall Nations, ch.1. v.1. whereas in Al.20.28. the charge is to the particular Elders of Ephesus to that whole flock; therefore that note of respectivenesse is here put en suiv in among you: that is, that flock which respectively belongs to you, as Coloss. 1. 17. Who is for you a faithfull Minister, that is, your proper Pastor: So the flock en suiv is your severall proper flocks that belong to you. And hereby it appears that their oversight is not extendible beyond their feeding. Thus also Hebr. 13. ver. 7. Remember them that have the rule over you, and have spoken to you the Word of God; which he speaks of preaching Elders, and of ruling Elders (of whom he speaks, ver. 17.) Obey

them that have the RULE over you, for they watch for your fouls, as those that must give an accompt. And whether these places note out two fort of Offices, Preaching Elders, ver. 7. and Ruling Elders, ver. 17. or but one fort, and so but severall acts of the same Office, however, if but one, yet still the ordinary rule over them was not farther extendible then their ordinary preaching; if two forts of Officers, they being Officers together in the same Church, if the Pastors power of ruling extends no farther then his preaching, then the meer ruling Elders power, (or his that is assistant to him) must extend no farther then the Pastors also: this is the naturall obligation to obedience, and so is the measure to set the bounds of the extent of ordinary Church tower. 'Tis one argument used against Episcopall power, that they are inforced to obey him that speaks not the word to them, nor watches over their fouls; And this holds as well against these Presbyteriall Officers. When a man to be excommunicated comes before fuch if he faies I am not bound to obey you in fuch an authoritative way, nor do I owe a subjection as to a power of censure in you, for many, yea most of you, never spake the word unto me, nor did watch over my foul; nay, perhaps the man can say, he never saw their faces afore.

And it avails not to say that they may occasionally preach; for take two places more, the I Theff. 5. 12. speaking of respect to their Officers, Know them that labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you: These two labour, and are over you, are commensurable; that is, who make it their calling to have a care of you, which the many Pastors and Elders in a common Presbytery cannot. And labour, in what? I Tim. I. 17. expounds it, That labour in word and Dostrine: The Elders that rule well, are worthy of double honour, especially those that labour in the word and Doctrine. And expound this latter known place, whether of Teaching Elders only, or ruling and teaching both (as the Reformed Churches doe) however it affords this to us; that the extent of ruling in either the one or the other, is but as large as teaching: And if it be meant of Teaching Elders only, that both rule and labour in the word and Dollrine, yet if they be limited in labouring in the Word (as they are being fixed Pastors to their own Congregations) then in ruling. And if it be meant of ruling Elders ( as distinct from them ) yet their ruling is but of the same extent, that the others labouring in the word is, and that is extended but to one Congregation.

And secondly, Reason is for this; For in a Pastors Office in which Preaching and Ruling are joyned, yet his power of ruling, flows in him, from, and is the adjunct of his power to preach, and to be sure it is not extendible further; and however, yet there is the same proportion of either, and then by just reason, the extent of the Church, which is the subject of his ordinary ruling, cannot be extended larger then what is the ordinary subject of his preaching, and so these

2 relations

relations are of equal limits; If a father hath the power of governing, as a father, then it is extendible onely to those he is a father to. And that a Pastor hath his ordinary ruling power annexed to his ordinary power of preaching, is proved by these reasons.

First, If not upon this ground, then upon some other: not by any special saculty and Office, over and above this of Preaching, for then he should be ordained a ruling Elder over and above his being first a preaching Elder as a new saculty given him; or by being made a Ruler first, and then this of preaching su-

peradded, as the Bishops first made Deacons, then Presbyters. But

Secondly, All the keyes are given him at once, the keyes of ruling with the keyes of knowledge, the power of the staffe intrinsecally followes, his being a Pastor or Shepherd; and though the one is a power of meer order, namely, that of Preaching, and that of his Ruling be a power of jurifdiction (to be exercised with others and not alone) yet still his receiving power to joyne with others in those acts of Rule of jurisdiction is from this his power of Order, and the ordinary extent of his authority therein, is extendible no farther then his or-

dinary call to preach. Yea

Thirdly, The extent of the power of the Apostles themselves, in ruling in all the Churches was founded upon, and extendible with their commission to preach in all Churches, and their very call and obligation being not to preach in a set sixed relation, as ordinary Pastors calling is, but to all Churches in all Nations: Hence their power of ruling was answerable. It was their very call to be universall Pastors, and therefore universall Rulers; yea and in reference to those that are without, their authority of ruling was narrower, in the extent of it, then of their preaching. The Apostles might preach to Heathens, and their call was so to doe, to convert them, but they had not power to rule all men: What have I to doe to judge them that are without? But in this way of Presbyteriall Government, though they also may occasionally preach where they may not rule, yet the proportion of their ordinary ruling, is extended beyondthe proportion of their ordinary preaching, which it was not in the Apostles themselves.

Secondly, It breeds an incongruous disproportion between the Offices of Ruling and Preaching Elders compared among themselves, for this Government makes this Extent of the Ruling Elders office and relation, to be larger then that of their Teachers or Pastors; for the Pastor, quâ Pastor, is limited to his particular Congregation he is fixed to, for the ordinary performance of his office, as the Deacons also are; but the Ruling Elders Office, quâ Ruling Elder, is extended over all these Congregations in this Presbyterie. The Ruling Elder performes his office in the highest perfection of it, as to admonish, excommunicate in all these Churches, but the Pastors are limited in the highest work of their

Callings,

#### concerning Presbyteriall Government.

Callings, (Preaching being more excellent then Ruling, yea then Baptizing is) unto one Congregation; That in the first Epistle to Tim. chap. 5: v. 17. (interpret it as you will) justifies this.

Thirdly, It perverts the order and distinction of Teaching Elders, and meer Ruling Elders (as the Reformed Churches call them) or Church Governours (as the Assembly) That whereas Christ hath made some Teaching Elders, and fome Ruling Elders, and these distinct in this, that the Preaching Elders Office is to preach and rule, the Ruling Elders Office only to rule: this frame of Presbyteriall government, makes one person, not only to do both these works, (which in a particular Congregation every Pastor doth ) but formally to beare both those Offices, in respect of a double relation he doth sustein, namely, of a Pastor, to be a Preaching Elder to the Congregation where he is fixed, and a meer ruling Elder to the rest of the Congregations of the Classicall Church: for it is demanded, when a Paftor in a particular Congregation is in this common Presbytery, what fort of Officer he is to that Presbyteriall Church? An Elder he is, because he doth the work of an Elder; A Teaching Elder to that Church he is not, for to that whole Church he labours not in the word and Do-Etrine. Timothy, Epist. I. ch. 5. v. 17. Therefore a meer ruling Elder he must be, and so the same man bears two sorts of Offices, and by this means there are two forts of meer ruling Elders: whereas in a particular Congregation, a Pafor though he rules, yet he ruleth as a Pastor to that Congregation. And this disorder and confusion is further set out, in that, by this means the same Officer hath a full relation to one Church, and but half a relation to another, and causeth him to perform the whole of his Office to one Church (the particular Church he hath relation to ) and but the half thereof to the other.

Fourthly, It makes an incongruous disproportion between the Extent of the relation of those two Offices of Elders and Deacons unto a Church. If the Scriptures had intended many Churches making one Church, and the Elders of those many Churches to have been Elders in common to those Churches as one Church, then in like manner the Deacons of all those Churches should make up a common Deaconry, and be Deacons in common unto all those Churches in an ordinary way as the other are Elders: But this is contrary to the practise of the Resormed Churches, though subject to the Presbyteriall Government, in which the Deacons have the ordinary relation of Deacons in no respect extended further then to a particular Congregation, nor do they exercise Acts of that Office in an ordinary way to other Congregations, nor otherwise to neighbour Congregations then to any other; much lesse is there a common Deaconship of them all. And why should not the later be erected over all those Churches as one Church, as well as a common Eldership? especially B.3.

II.

if in matters of this nature, par ratio should carry it; every Church, qua Church, being a body, hath a relation to all its Officers as Organical members thereof; So Rom 13. and the 4. And the Apostle writing to Philippi, a Church in a City, he writes to the Bishops [the Elders] and the Deacons as both alike Officers of that Church. And Acts 6. The Deacons of the Church of Jerusalem (if there were many Congregations as our brethren suppose) were chosen by the whole multitude when gathered together by the twelve. And therefore were Deacons of the whole Church as well as the Elders, Elders thereof. Now if the Deacons Office should thus be extended to all the Congregations as the Elders is, then why should not each Church be bound to bring contributions to the Deacons of each Church, and to be distributed in common? and so our purses should be subject to the Deacons in common, as far as our persons to the Elders in common, and they might challenge the same power. in their Office over the one, that the Elders do over the other; and then also euch Congregation were in an ordinary and standing obligation bound to relieve all the Poor in those Churches, as well as those in their own Parishes, not only by the common law of Charity, but by vertue of special relation of their being one Church, which relation in all these things, doth beget the like Obligation that it doth in government; and so all things of this nature should be alike common to all and each, and there should be a common Treasury for this one great Diaconat Church, as we may in a paralel allusion to that other name of Presbyteriall, call it.

A second head of Incongruities, and Inconsistencies which will follow upon it, are in the mutual duties required, and that doe necessarily follow upon this standing relation for a constant government of these Elders to all this people of

these Churches, and of the people to these Elders.

1. From the People to all these Elders. According unto what the Scripture speaks of, as due to standing Elders, they owe at least honour and esteem; yea, maintenance to all their Elders, whether those that ordinarily rule them or preach to them; and they owe it for both, I Tim. chap. 5. v. 17: & 18. Let the Elders that rule well, be counted Worthy of double honour, especially those that labour in the word and Dostrine. Which honour is expressed by the Analogy of that law, ver. 18. not to muste up the month of the Oxe that treadeth out the corne. And this is certainly due to Elders, for all, that is the work of Elders, whether performed apart, or together, by way of jurisdiction in a Presbytery; And it cannot be denied, but that their constant ruling as in the Presbytery, is one great part of the worke of Elders, and so must be here intended, for which an especiall honour is due. And as they are to feed all and every one in the flock, as Alts 20. ver. 28. so maintenance and honour is due from all people to all and every one of these Elders, as well to those that

that rule, as those that labour in the Word and Doctrine. And in reason, if the Elders that rule well (and performe the lesser acts of ruling) in their particular Congregations, and the Presbyteries thereof are to have this honour in their relations, then all those Elders that rule well in the common Tresbytery (and perform the greatest acts of ruling) are to have the like from all that Classicall Church: the emphasis being put upon ruling well, and in those acts done by them the excellency of ruling confifteth, and the precept is not to honour Presbyteries in some abstract notion, but Elders: because the particular persons of the Elders are to be the object of it, and those most who excell most in that rule, that rule well or best; but when there are many Congregations that have their proper fixed Pastors and Elders whom they maintain for performing one part of the Elders work (for they perform but one part of it ) how shall they perform this due to all the rest for that other part of it? and it is due from every person as he is able, or he cannot persorm his duty. How burthensome, how confused would this be? And then how to proportion this, suppose it should not be maintenance, but honour and esteem, this people will not be able to judge; not only for that they cannot be present at their work. and so cannot judge of it; but because either it must be proportioned to them as confrant Preaching Elders, or as Ruling; not as to Preaching Elders, for they labour not to them as such; (the ground upon which it is required is, That they tread out their Corn) and to honour and esteem them as Ruling Elders only, were to honour Preaching Elders below the rank and degree of their Office. So

Secondly, It brings the like Incongruities upon the performance of those duties of Elders, which the New Testament indifferently requires of all those that it acknowledgeth to be Elders unto a people, and therefore no such constant relation of Elders to so many Churches may be. As first, Praying with the fick, Send for the Elders of the Church to pray for them, Jam. chap. 5. ver. 14. What, are these Elders of a Presbyteriall Church bound hereto? this duty lies in common upon Elders of Churches, and how shall we distinstuish when the Scripture doth not? Secondly, Visiting from house to house, as Paul in his example instructs the Elders of Ephesus, Att.ch. 20. v.20. Thirdly, Watching over mens souls, as those that must give accompt, Hebr. chap. 13. ver. 17. To watch, is not to stay till causes are brought by appeals or so, from the Congregations, but personally to observe and oversee them, as souls committed to them, which they must give an accompt for. Fourthly, of Preaching, (if Preaching Elders) in season and out of season. The Bishops, they said the flock was theirs, and the whole care committed to them: and to salve the incongruity of not being able to preach themselves to them, they professed a derivative deleguted power to inferior Pastors, whom they called their Curats. This was plain dealing: but these Elders make all the Whole flock theirs and this from those Scriptures

III.

Scriptures that speak of Elders and flock, and themselves not Curats, and so personally obliged according to the rules in Scripture, and yet cannot performe it, which is a Worse Incongruitie.

If it be faid, that they may part these duties among them.

Ubi Scriptura non distinguit, nec nos debemus distinguere. Now all those duties that are spoken of Elders to the flocks, they are without distinction, as in respect of the object to whom they are extended. Paul faith to those of Ephelin, Feed the flock. Peter the like to those he writes to The Flock, in opin respectively, To feed and to take the overlight of them. The author to the Hebrewes, To match over their fouls; And to the Thessalonians, he describes them to be those that are over them. & labour and admonish them. When those Injunctions are thus laid upon all, how shall the consciences of Elders be able to part and distinguish their discharge of them, and to fay, Though I am an Elder in common to all in these Congregations, yet I am bound but to governe them in greater matters, and to admonish them as with others, when publickly met in a Confistorie, and am bound to no other acts of Eldership; and yet to this particular Congregation, I am obliged to private admonition, rule, watchfulnesse, &c. Where hath the Scripture set these bounds, or thus parted them? And therefore certainly all these places hold forth fingly, only the Elders and their duties of a particular. Church fixed thereto, as knowing no other: 'Twas necessary Christ should have fet the bounds and given the distinction, and not indifferently lay all these upon all. And either in these places the duties of Elders in a common Presbyterie are contained, and that under the notion of Elders to those, or they are not to be found in the New Testament. And all these may be brought in several Arguments alone by themselves against the main Proposition, though here they come in onely as branches of the minor.

Lastly, This is inconsistent with the ordinary way of the Call of Elders held forth in the word, and the Principles of the Reformed Churches.

There are two parts of this Call. First, Choice. Secondly, Ordination.

First for Choice, Chamier in the name of all the Reformed Churches, allowes the people this, the approbation of their Elders, and so in Scotland. And if the Apostles themselves allowed them the choice of the Deacons, that had the charge of the Church treasury, took care of their bodies; then much more of their Elders that have to doe with their consciences. Looke what ever the right of the people is in the choice of them that should preach to them, there is as much reason they should have the exercise of it in the choice of those Elders that in a common Preshyteric doe rule over them, for they perform one part of the Elders duty, namely Ruling, as the Preaching Elders do the other; and therefore by the equity of the same law, that speakes of Elders indefinitely, if they choose any Elders as Elders to them, they are to choose these also, there being

#### concerning Presbyteriall Government.

no distinction put of chusing Preaching Elders onely, but Elders indefinitely; And surther, the greatest and highest acts of power over them, are committed in an ordinary way unto them, as of Excommunication, of all punishments the most formidable: there is put as much, if not more then every mans life (that is a member of that Classicall Church) into their hands, the enjoyment of all Ordinances for ever: And so the power of deposing their Ministers already six'd to them, and of resusing to ordaine them, they shall approve: And therefore in antiquity, of all other the persons of the Bishops, who had the power of all those, were chosen by all the people, and by Panegyricall meetings.

And it is strengthened by this further parallel: A Ministers Call hath two parts: first, Ordination, which belongs to the Elders. Secondly, Choice, in which the people have some interest: These Elders, as Elders in common, and these Congregations as one Church be relatives, and so that interest which a Church, quâ Church hath, is commensurable to the interest of these Elders; quâ Elders: If therefore in ordaining, all the Elders in a common Presbytery, do joyne to ordain an Officer, then all the people, quâ Church, must joyn in chusing or approving him: neither can their common right of chusing be swallowed up by the

interest of their Elders ordaining him.

And if it be said they all chuse by vertue of the generall Law of combination, as the Shires Parliament men. The constitution of the State makes the one; if the like be found in Scripture it will be sufficient: but if not, but that this interest must be common to the people of the Classicall Church, it is asked, when a fix'd Pastor is to be chosen to a particular charge, what Office he shall be chosen to by the people of the other Congregations? Not to a Pastors Office, he is not to be such to them; if to be a ruling Elder onely, then, besides that he hath two Offices (as afore) so now he must have two choices, and two Ordinations: We chuse him for our Pastor, saies the particular Church he belongs to: and we, say the other, to Ruling. And besides, in his Ordination, the people have an interest of presence and joyning in the fasting and prayer at his Ordination: and this therefore must be performed, either in a panegyricall meeting of all, (which cannot be) or in all the severall Churches, which will multiply the Ordination of them.

#### The Major Proposition confirmed.

In regard that the main Argumentation of such as contend for a Presbyteriall Government (as in their writings and otherwayes appeares) is from the mention of the Elders of such and such a Church (as, serusalem, &c.) having many Congregations (as they suppose.) The consequence of the Major was taken so much for granted as on all sides agreed on, as it was less insisted upon the first day; but being denyed and answered thus, that they beare not the relation

 $\mathbf{C}$ 

of Elders, but of a Presbytery, because, quod convenit toti qua toti, non convenit cuilibet parti; And that if Elders, yet in sensu composito non diviso, As a Colonell is a Colonell to a particular Regiment, but in a Councell of War, not so to all Regiments: A head of a particular Tribe is an head to his own Tribe divisively, but not so to all

the Tribes, and the like.

For that Logicall Axiome: 'Tis true, quod convenit toti qua toti, non convenit cuilibet parti: and so here, that which doth competere toti, to the whole of these Elders, be'ongs not to every part; for take them all as met together, they are a Presbytery, and accordingly each Elder is not a Presbytery to all these Congregations, nor doth the Argument suppose it, but onely that if they be a common Presbytery to all these Congregations, that they then bear the relation of Elders; As take an heap of stones, 'tis true, each stone is not an heap of stones, but each stone is a stone in that heap. So this Company of Elders, must be supposed both a Presbytery, and also Elders to this whole people and every member of them: which is farther proved thus;

I. The Scriptures would have the people look at them and honour them as Elders in all acts of Ruling as well as in Preaching, and especially wherein the most and chief of ruling lies, and wherein the excellency of their ruling is seen; They rule most and best when met in this common Presbytery: upon that relation we are to honour them, as performing this rule, and under that relation they must be said to perform it: The Elders that rule well, are worthy of double honour, especially those that labour in the word and Doctrine, Tim. 5.17. And besides, otherwise we destroy the relation of Elders, quâ Elders, in the highest

acts of governing, which are exercised only in a Presbytery.

2. The New Testament doth indifferently and promiscuously use the word Presbytery, and the word Elders, of the same persons in relation to the same people; and therefore to whom these Elders are supposed to be a Presbytery, they must bear the relation of Elders, Mat. 21. 23. those that are called Elders of the people, are called, Luke 22. apersurgion to the Presbytery of the people: so as if they related as a Presbytery to the people, to the same people they related

ted as Elders.

Secondly, For that distinction of their being Elders onely in a community to all those Congregations as one Church, in sensu aggregato, but not in sensu diviso, to every person thereof, as was instanced in Burgesses, &c. First, This Church as it is totum aggregatum, is but an abstract notion, but the rale and government of the Elders in a Presbytery, fal's upon persons in particular, and every member of that Church; if therefore they be Elders in the Presbytery to that Church, it must be that they are Elders to every person therein. Again, it must be remembred where we are, namely upon what the Scriptures hold forth, so the Proposition runneth. And if there had been those differing relations of Elders, (which

#### concerning Presbyteriall Government.

( which from those similitudes in Common-wealths, Armies, and the Universities are given ) it were necessary the Scripture should have held it forth by like differing names and respects, or by differing charges, whereby it might appear that this relation obligeth them to this duty, and this other relation to that, which being not done is therefore to us a fiction. That it was necessary appeares from the instances themselves, As in that of the Tribes, there were generall Elders of all the Tribes, and there were (and perhaps some of them the same men) that were Heads and Elders of the particular Tribes. But as this was a differing relation and respect in the same, or divers persons, so they had names and titles of difference and distinction: For the Heads generall (as we may call them) were called Elders of the people. The particular Elders of particular Tribes, were called by the way of distinction from them, Elders of fuch Cities, Families, &c. And there were as distinct lawes given in such cases. The Elders of the severall Tribes did such and such particulars in their Tribes respectively, and the generall Elders had referved cases of Blashemy, &c. set down by the Law. So in that instance of the Heads of Colledges, and Heads of the University, there is as a differing, so a distinguishing Character: the names are changed, the particular bodies are called Colledges, the generall body the University, and their severall speciall relations to their Colledges is expressed by the Title of Masters of such and such Colledges, and the other by the title of Heads to the University. Yea, and accordingly there are differing flatutes, the locall statutes for each Colledge a-part, or for Colledges as Colledges, and the duties of Masters in their speciall relations : and there are statutes for the Universitie and their duties as Heads thereof : and this distinction and difference was necessary, if there were this differing relation. But for the case in hand, if we come to the New Testament to find out these severall jurisdictions and Relations of Elders, therein we still read but simply and singly Elders and Churches as Relatives, no such note of distinction. And also speaking of the duties of Elders to the people, and people to Elders, it speakes simularly and univocally: so as whoever will take upon them to be Elders, all those duties fall upon them, let them distinguish how they can. And to confirm this, the instances in the Minor serve. And where the Scripture doth not distinguish, we are not to distinguish. And if the Elders of a particular Congregation are Elders to that Church, both in sensu diviso, and every member thereof, and also in sensu composito, in their Presbyteries unto the whole; then those generall Elders must beare the like relation to that Classicall Church and every Member of it; else the difference is so vast, and the consequent difference of duties thereupon depending such, as it was necessary a distinction should have been made in Scripture, that each might know their duties.

If all the Records, Lawes, and Ruled cases of this Kingdome, should in setting down the ordinary government thereof, have made mention onely and singly of

2 Burgesses

Burgesses (as the Rulers) and of Corporations (as the Correlate to them) and u-sed no other distinguishing word; and there were undeniably Burgesses of every Incorporate Town continued from antiquity: if any would afterwards pretend that this word Corporation was intended by our Ancestors to import an Association or Community of many of these Corporations into one Shire, and that by Burgesses of those Corporations were meant a community of all those Burgesses in one body for Government, and so pretend the same names w thout distinction, and say they were also meant : yea, and further, if the Lawes and Charters concerning such Burgesses in each Corporation, the duties given them in charge by the Law in their relations to their Corporations, did run without any distinction of what the Burgesses in the supposed greater Corporation should do in that relation and community, from what the same Burgesles in their lesser Corporations in a more proper relation do : Yea, and if the Duties set down in those Lawes mutually between Corporations, and those Burgesses should argue an inconsistency with the government of Burgesses over many Corporations in common (as the minor here shewes it to be in our case) but all naturally fall in with that of Burgesses over single Corporations: In this case to say that therefore this Kingdome did hold forth, there might not be (that is, according to the lawes thereof) such a government of the Burgesse of Corporations over many Corporations, were not this a right way of arguing to overthrow such a pretence ?

And if in answer to such arguments it should be said, that both these might be consistent: For, that in forein States, and Kingdomes, and Societies, there are Burgesses of particular Corporations, and there are Burgesses in an Assembly of Parliament (so called by way of distinction) met in common, for the ordinary government of all those Corporations in common, and therefore the like may be here in this. The reply were easie, that what ever such distinction there is in other States, yet the question is of such Burgesses as the Lawes of this State hold forth, the question is of such Burgesses as this Kingdom hath set up where there is no distinction of Burgesses of Corporations, and Burgesses in Parliament mentioned. But on the contrary onely, one single uniform stile and title in the Lawes, namely, Burgesses of the Corporation and duties suited thereunto. Now parallel to this case are our Arguments, and the Answers given thereto.

Lastly, if they be Elders onely in sensu aggregato, yet so farre as they are acknowledged thus Elders, so far will many of the incongruities in the Minor sollow them, and sal upon them, as that still they are but meerely Ruling Elders,

and that there be Deacons in sensu aggregato.

REASONS against, and EXCEPTIONS to the first proofe of the FIRST ASSERTION, viz.

That the Church of Jerusalem consists the more Congregations then one, from the multitude of Beleevers.

I Irst, Reasons to shew there were not more then could meet in one place.

The Holy Ghost hath from first to last as on purpose shewed this, as if his scope had been aforehand to prevent and to preclude all reasonings to the

contrary.

1. In the beginnings of that Church, their meetings are set out to us by two Adjuncts. First, that they met our down with one accord in the same duty of prayer, Alts 1.14. And secondly, in no wird, together in one and the same company, ver. 15. Which therefore is there and usually translated in one place. And that here by these words the intent of the Holy Ghost is to shew their meeting in one and the same Assembly, is evident. For whereas in the 15. verse 'cis said Peter stood up in the midst of them, (as therefore being present together in one company) he adds, And the number of them that were in to ou to, that is present together in company, were an hundred and twenty.

2. Then ch. 2, v. 1. Another meeting of theirs for worship at Pentecost is continued to be expressed in the same phrases a second time, They were all with one

accord in one place.

3. Then when about three thousand, yet still some of their meetings then for some acts of worship are recorded to have been as before with one accord, as joyning unanimously in the same duty, and in stead of that former expression im' to aw to (used of the formes meetings) there is the mention of the place it self, where they met, set down to supply it, and so to interpret it, and shews it was still in one Assembly, vers. 46. They continued daily with one accord IN. THE TEMPLE, as mentioning the very place where they had their most frequent meetings which were for bearing, as being there altogether in one Affembly; and not as comming thither only for Jewish worship: for it is faid of these as of the former meetings mentioned, which were proper to themselves; That they continued with one accord. And though they held these meetings in this place for preaching, that the Jews might be present to hear, &c. Yet that hindred not, but it was a Church meeting to them; wherein they continued with one accord; which expression is still used of all their Christian meetings throughout this Story, Atts 1, 14. & 4. 24. & 5. 12. & 15.25.

4. When.

4. When there was a further addition to these, Chap. 5. Verse 1. (whether to five thousand or no, is spoken to afterwards ) yet in that Chapter, he making a description of their State, in almost all the very same particulars by which he had done it before, Chap. 2. from Verse 43. unto the end (as by the parallel comparing of these two passages of the Story will appear;) he lastly speaking of a meeting of theirs (which is the point in hand) as carefully puts in, as in the former. Verse 14. And they were ALL with one accord in Solomons Porch, the fame words he had used Chap. 2. Verse 46. Their union and joyning together with one accord being carefully indigitated, and the place named in stead of 'க் ரம் மயர்6, as was observed before. And that the [ All that met ] were not the Apostles only, appears not only by the forementioned parallel of this with Chap. 2. Verse 46. where their being with one accord in the Temple, is spoken of all the multitude, and so here. But secondly, that all the Apostles should be met with one accord in any duty, and not the people who are said to continue in the Apostles Doctrine and Prayer, and Suo Buuasiv ( or with one accord) still in the story of this Church referring to communion in some holy duty, as Chap. 1. Verle 14. and Chap. 4. Verle 24, is most unlikely. And Solomons Porch was a place large enough to hold them, and fitted for preaching and to hear, which in Fohn 10. Verse 22, is called the Temple; and so is the place intended in Acts 2. Verse 46. They met in the Temple, that is, in the Porch of Solomon. It was the outer Court, as fosephus lib. 20. cap. 8. It was the place where CHRIST used to walk and preach, and the Apostles also, chap. 3. v. 11. The multitude ran to Solomons Porch.

5. When again upon mention of this multiplication of Disciples, the Deacons are to be chosen, the Apostles called the multitude, chap. 6. v. 2. and not perfons selected, but all; for v. 5. they are called [the whole multitude] and they are spoken to, as together, For the saying pleased [the whole] and the [whole] chose seven men out from among them, and set them before the Apostles, ver. 6. as being in one place together, and they prayed (in which the multitude had an interest to joyne with them) and laid on them hands. And this meeting was certainly a Church meeting, and yet still in some one place; and therefore though it might fall out that alwayes they should not have met together in one, yet they both did and could.

6. After that great dispersion mentioned, chap. 8. v. 1. Then as they might more conveniently meet in one place and assembly, so that they did so, it is as carefully recorded, that so the Holy Ghost might hold forth this from the first unto the last mention of this Church, AE. 15. AEt. 21. 22. The multitude must needs come together. And to interpret διωθυμαθών, or with one accord, which the Holy Ghost carries through all, to be intended of the joyning of the same persons in the same act of worship (for which they still did meet)

is genuine; for it imports that which is the spirit and life of publick worship, which of all other actions done by a multitude, is to have the nearest union of spirits, as that wherein the Communion of Saints in worship consists. And then naming the place where they met also, it must needs import Onenesse of Assembly which also holds forth in this example this duty: That as Saints when met in worship should joyn with one accord, so living in a place together, should as farre as posfibly may, joyn themselves to one Assembly: and this carries with it such an appearance as is not in the other sense. And that the Holy Ghost should in the Same story of the same Church set forth the unity of their first meetings, as in one and the same individual Assembly, by this expression of being in one, and with one accord, Act. 1.2. and in the next mention not far off, carry along one of the same expressions, namely [with one accord] and together therewith shall name the place of their meeting, and yet in the latter intend not One, but meetings in feverall companies in that place, This we humbly submit to better judgements.

#### Secondly, Exceptions.

1. For the mention of five thousand, Chap. 4. Verse 4. This cannot be evinced from that place that the five thousand were a new number added to the three thousand. The words are these, Howbeit many of them that heard the word, beleeved; and the number of the men was about five thouland. But that this number of five thousand should refer to them that believed, is not certain; feeing both the Greek will bear it and favour it, as well to be meant of the number that heard, as of the men that beleeved; and of the two, that former is the more probable, that he should say of the men that heard they were five thousand, and that of them that heard many beleeved, this founds well, and is no way forced; but five thousand men to be converted at once, is that which was never afore nor fince. And the great conversion that our Divines have instanced in, is the three thousand, Alts Chapter 2, and not in this five thousand. And if the scope of the Holy Ghost therein, why the number of the men that heard should be here reckoned to be five thousand, be asked after, it was to shew what had occasioned the persecution, which he had spoken of, in the Verse before. Namely this, that such a multitude of the people should be taught and preached to; this fretted the Pharifees that came upon Peter and John; and with this agrees Bezain the second Verse, that they were grieved they taught the people, the essect is Cor. I whereof is, that many of them that heard believed, notwithstanding this 13. persecution; but how many of these is not certaine. And Beza and Calvin Budens and

and many others of our protestant Writers judge this number not to be of this new acceffion of Converts, but the totall number including the former; and the aidside although translated men, is when put alone (as there) all one with aidside ties fooken of such a promiscuous auditory. And if any should affirme it meant of Males onely, and them now converted, it would make a greater miracle then any other recorded, especially when the people are said to be converted verse 2, that did alike run to see the Miracle.

2. Exception is, That it may be supposed that all that are mentioned to be converted, remained not constant Members of that Church abiding at Jerusalem until the dispersion; and so, though the Holy Ghosts scope may be to shew the increase of Converts to the faith, yet not of such as continued all that while at Je-

rusalem; and our reasons for that are these.

First, those three thousand who were converted, Ch. 2 were not settled dwel-

lers at Jerusalem, but strangers, Commorants of the ten Tribes, which were dispersed in all those Countries mentioned in the 2. Chap. Verse 9, who came up to the feast of Pentecost, as the manner of the Jews was. Acts 21, 20, 27, 28. Jews that lived in Asia, came to the feast of Pentecost as Paul also did, compared with Alts 20. 16. And the word which is translated Dwellers at Jern. salem, is interpreted by an eminent Critick, Sojourners at Jerusalem during this Feast, (although the word signifies both) & to that end he quotes the Septuagint in I Kings 17. 20. where Etijah cries unto the Lord, saying, O Lord my God, hast thou also brought evill upon the Widow, used' he ego rating with whom I sojourne onely? and that which confirmes it is, that they are faid to be dwellers or inhabitants of Mesopotamia and Indea, and Cappadocia, Vers. 9. They could not fixedly belong as dwellers to both. They were therefore rather sojourners in ferusalem now at the Feast, though fixed dwellers in all those places: For if they were fixed dwellers in ferufalem, to what end whilst they were at ferufalem should the Evangelist tell us they were sojourners in Mesopotamia? and they must needs rather be dwellers there, because they are said to understand every one his own language. And that which strengthens this is, that in the Greek there is this difference in the words in verses 5 and 9. in that they are said retroixed do ispured in Hierusalem, as for the present there: yea, and as to come, это такто в вого out of every Nation: but in the ninth Verse he changeth it, and sayes, yettoine vites The west worth with as inhabiters of Mesopotamia, and those other Countries where their fixed possessions were. And therefore verse 14. he cals them Men, JEWS and DWELLER's at JER US ALEM, as two forts; and v. 22. Men of Ifrael, the stile given those of the ten Tribes scattered; Men devout, as Verse 5' who came up at those solemne times, having wives and children and their families at home, to whom they used after a time to returne. Now although these were added and

1ede iatribe and made members of that Church, and are said to continue in the Apostles doctrine: yet that will not necessarily imply that they continued all the time till the dispersion at Jerusalem; but whilst they were there, they were aportagleparles, that is, they cleaved to the Apostles: but to think that many of them comming as strangers should not go down to their wives and children, which Nature taught them to provide for, and religion taught them to take care of their fouls, or to fetch them up to them: so as this might well be a finid Church, ebbing and flowing as touching the residence of its members: yea, some of these were of Indea, v.9. and so of the Country about; and of them might be Churches erected in their proper dwellings is rationally supposable. For in that persecution, in Act. 8. 1. it is said that Paul persecuted Disciples in other places then at Hierusalem, Acts 26.10. Which things I also did at Hierusalem. (saies he) and in other places, at Damascus. And also it is confirmed by this, that upon the ceasing of Pauls persecution it is said, Act. 9. 31. then had the Churches rest through Indea and Galilee, and are said to be at rest in distinction from the persecution raised, ch. 8.1.

3 Exception is, that they in those Countries and times had often great Assemblies consisting of many thousands hearers at once, that did and could hear, Luke 12.1. Christ preached to Myriads, many thousands; and Ast. 13.44. almost an whole City came to hear the word of Godby Paul. And at Charenton, how many thousands may and do hear, is well known; and so in many places of England. And Moses sometime spake in the eares of all the people, and so Exra 10.9, 10. And 'tis known by experience, that as in hot Countries they may see as far again, through the purenesse of the aire, so they may hear at a far greater distance, then in our colder

Climate.

4 Exception is, that this being the first Church, and whereof all the Apostles were the Officers, those therefore, that dwelt there, would certainly abide together as one Church without parting or dividing, even till they came to the utmost proportion that the constitution of a Church was capable of; and so Maximum quod sic: And continue together in one, for the more united strength and glory of holding forth the name of Christ in one body, united for the honour of Religion and communicating in Ordinances together.

5 Exception is, that they had during all this time of their multitudes until the persecution of Paul arose, the greatest freedome and liberty even to the utmost; for the people magnified them, ch. 5. v. 12. they had fa-

vour with all the people, ch.2.v.47. Insomuch, that although the Rulers fell upon two of them, John and Peter, yet they were enforced to let them go, fin ding nothing how to punish them, because of the people, chap.4. v.21. Besides that, it was no new thing amongst the Jewes for Sects to have great multitudes to follow and cleave to them, and to preach in any place, (as in Spaine and Italy) and to baptize openly as John and Christ did.

## Reasons and Answers to the Appendix added to the former Proof, viz.

That the dispersion mentioned in Act. 8. 1. doth not simply prove such a scattering, as that there might not remain more Congregations then one in that Church, Act. 9.31.& 12.24.& 21.20.

Hus having shewed the multitudes not arising to that number, but, I that they might meet in one: now after the differsion much lesse. And so that end let the greatnesse of the Persecution be considered to demonstrate the greatnesse of this dispersion; Its called not a Persecution onely, but a great Persecution, both extensively and intensively; for the extent of it to all forts of persons, entring into every house, vers. 3. and for the height of it, it being to imprisonment, even unto death, chap. 22.4. Acts 26. 10. It is also called, a making havock of the Church, vers. 9. The object of this Persecution was not Preachers onely, but Christians of all forts indifferently, for it is faid indefinitely to be upon the Church, v. I. and vers. 3. It is is call'd an entring into every house, hayling men and momen: and in chap. 26. Paul speaking of this very Persecution (wherein he had a speciall hand ) saies vers. 10. that he imprisoned many of the Saints (not Preachers only) and ver. 9. his aime was promiscuously against the Name of JE sus; and so any that professed his Name: Unto this end compa e the varying the expression used by the holy Ghoft, when speaking of this Persecution, and of another mentioned, Att. 12.1. there it is said, Herod stretched forth his hand to vex CERTAIN of the Church; but here it is against the Chur CH in Jerusalem, Men and women in every house. And ALL except the Apostles (the word want [except] there is to shew, that none of the Apostles) were scattered, though the generality

of others were; if men gifted fled away, then others also, except we suppose the people more couragious to stay by it then the Teachers. And whereas it is faid, that these that were dispersed, went about preaching the mord, vers. 4. First, it argueth not that Preachers only or chiefly were dispersed; for (as Calvin saith) it comes in to shew what was the fruit of the dispersion; and we may well suppose women and whole families to have been scattered abroad, who yet preached not: And secondly, it was ordinary in those times, for men that were not by Office Ministers, occasionally to teach the word in private waies of converse, yea and otherwise; And that is not call'd teaching onely, which is by way of Sermon to a multihude, for vers. 25. of this chap. Philip in private conference taught the Eunuch, as Aguila and Priscilla taught Apollos; & they are not called Evaylerisai, as having an Office, but evaylericquevoi, as referring to the act, the work they did: And that the word feems to found as if they made it their work. It may well be attributed to the zeal of those daies to gain Proselites, and not to an Office committed to them; they went not forth by mission but persecution. And here the many Congregations are brought but to an (it might be) and the grand Proposition it self, is but an (it may be) And how can it may be, be proved by an it might be? especially in such things as need have a strong foundation for matters, upon which fo great alterations are like to be made.

"But it is said, that it appears that there were multitudes of believers

"there after that time, by Acts 9.31.& 12.24. & 21.20.

First, For Act. 9.31. Emachinoso, signifies not ordinarily a great number made up, but an increase (Mat. 21. 12. & 1 Pet. 1.2. Grave be multiplied, it is the same word) not in number, but in measure. Again, they are the Churches of sudea, Galilee, and of Samaria. But what is all this to prove that there were so many in the Church of Hierusalem as could not meet in one?

For Acts 21. 20. To oan pupies to how many thousands doth not argue it; For first it was the Feast of Pentecost: when Paul came now up to Hierusalem in Acts 20.16. it is said of this journey, that he hasted if possible, to be at Hierusalem upon the day of Pentecost: When the Jewes out of all quarters came to Hierusalem, and the great concourse that then would be there at the Feast, moved him to aime to be there at that time. And by the journall of Paul thither, from his sirst setting out

D<sub>2</sub> from

ting the daies of his travailing, which the Holy Ghost hath recorded, vers. 16.21. Alls 21.2. it appears he came in few weeks unto Tyre, (but forty miles off from Hierusalem) time enough to come to the Feast; and no wonder if at the Feast he found thousands of the fewes. And this is confirmed by the 27 verse, for the fewes which laid hold on him in the Temple, were as it is said, fewes of Asia, not of fudea. Secondly, the word μυριας, being put without any other word of number, signifies no more then a great multitude, as μύριαν πλήθω; or a greatnesse, as εν μυεία ας Plato hath it; and being put indefinitely, is all one to say thousands, or many; as the Latins also use a definite for an indefinite, as Sexcenta possum proferre decreta, as Tully speaks.

#### To the second Proof of the first head.

By the many Apostles and other Preachers in this Church of Hierusalem; For if there were but one Congregation, then each Apostle preached but seldome, which will not stand with AEts 6.2.

#### First, For the Apostles.

They took all opportunities to fill their hands with work, preaching daily in the Temple and in every honse, Acts 5.42. ch.2.46. Paul also taught in Ephesus, as, publickly in the Congregation, so, from house to honse, Act. 20. 20. Also when any in the places abroad in Indea, or else where, were converted (and many Churches were then erected in Indea) the Apostles went abroad, as chap. 8. shews; and besides, how were the imployed, when for forty daies they met in an upper room, Act. 1. and had but an hundred and swenty for their flock.

#### Secondly, For the many Teachers.

In those times there were many guisted men that were not Officers, who occasionally instructed others, as Aquila did Apollos: yea those guists

guifts were so plentiful, that in that one Church of Corinth, I Cor. 14.23. almost all of them had Dostrines, Prophecying, speaking with tongues, and vet these were not Officers: so as if Congregations should be multiplied according to the number of such guifted men, then there would have been almost as many teachers as members of Congregations. And the powring out of the Holy Ghost, which was more ordinary then, did not make every man a Teacher by Office, for then all those in Samaria should have been made Teachers, Acts 8. And that not any of these were in Office, seems evident by this; That when the Deacons were chosen, chap. 6. there is no mention made of Elders in their Ordination, in which if any Elders had been, they had had an interest: We read Acts 15. When there were Elders, though Apostles were also then in that Church, both are mentioned together. And it appears the Apostles had managed all the affaires of that Church untill then : those Deacons being the first choice of any sort of Officers: the work of Administration of all sorts having layen on the Apostles hands.

#### To the third Proof of the first Head.

The diversity of Languages among st the Believers, Acts 2.8,9, 10, 11. & Acts the 6. doth argue more Congregations then one in the Church of Hierusalem.

First, 'tis true, there were, in that 2. of the Acts, Out of all Nations that heard the Apostles speak in the severall Languages of the Countries they were born in; but yet these were all either Jewes or Proselites, was were, worshippers, as v.5. who came up to worship, and some parts of the worship were audible; and though borne in other Countries (the Jewes being dispersed) yet all were generally learned and understood the Hebrem tongue, the language of their own Nation, even as to this day the Jewes and their Children doe; which seems evident stom the story in the 29,21, & 22. chap. of the Acts, Paul came up with divers Grecians to the Feast of Pentecost, chap. 20. v.4. unto which the Jewes out of all quarters came, and being all at a solemn meeting in the Temple, chap. 21. ver. 27. The fewes out of Asia, strangers, stirred up all the people against him, and when, ch. 22. v. 2. He made a speech to them, and they heard he D3

spake the Hebrew tongue, they kept silence and heard him patiently: And further those mentioned, AEL. 2. did understand all of them Peters Sermon; and though others spake, besides Peter to them in their own language the monderfull things of God, yet that was but a preparatory signe to them; as I Cor. 14. 22. making way for their Conversion, v. 11, 12. & 13. but the means of their Conversion was Peters Sermon after; and it was he also, that gave direction to them all what to doe to be saved: and therefore it must be spoken in some one common tongue, they all understood; and those gifts of languages given to the Apostles, were not out of a necessity to instruct these new Converts onely, but to sit them when they should go abroad into all the world, and to be a signe to the sews at present to convince them.

Secondly, for the Grecian Widows, Acts 6. the Hellenifts that lived amongst the Jewes, might well be supposed to understand Hebrew; and that these had not severall Congregations from the rest, appears by this, That the whole multitude together met, and chose the Deacons, It was a joint act: And if of differing languages, wherein the one understand not the other, occasioning such a distinction of Congregations (as the Proof would hold forth) how could they all have agreed in one meeting on the same man? But the Argument as well holds against the Presbyterial Association of those Congregations into one Church, people and Elders, unto which and in the communion and exercise whereof such Correspondencies and Intercourses are needfull, as they require one common language.

#### To the second Branch of this Argument.

That all these Congregations were under one Presbyteriall Government.

#### TROOFS.

1. Because they were but one Church.

Though it be one, yet they not being more then could meet in one, the Argument concludes not.

2 Proof. The Elders of that Church are mentioned.

There is no mention of any Elders in this Church, until after the a-forefaid Dispersion, Att. 8. And so the weight of this Argument will depend

pend

congregations, which the Reverend Assembly doth not so positively assign. The proof of their being such a Presbytery (as the Proposition intends) doth depend upon this their being called Elders to that Church: we no where read them called a Presbytery, & that therefore they are Elders, but they are There for a Presbytery (as here it is argued) because they are Elders to that Church; Now if they be Elders in common, because a Presbytery, (as was said in answer to our first Argument) then they are not to be argued a Presbytery only, because they are Elders in common; For then the Argument runs in Circulo. And the chief and first reason of their being Elders (for no other is mentioned) is accordingly held forth in their being Elders to that Church in common, whereas according to Presbyteriall Principles, there is a primary relation of Elders, qua Elders, to their particular fixed Congregations.

Reasons against the third proof of the second Branch, viz.

That the Apostles did the ordinary Acts of Presbyters as Presbyters in the Church of Hierusalem, doth prove a Presbyteriall Government in that Church before the dispersion.

The Proof of the Whole depends upon this Proposition: for though before the dispersion there had been many Congregations, yet not under

Elders, but Apostles.

Now it is granted that the substance of Ministerial Acts were one and the same in Apostles and Evangelists who were extraordinary, and in other ordinary Ministers. But first, though for the Act of Ministeriall power, it was the same in the Apostles, and them, yet in the extent of power (which is the point in question) therein the Apostles jurisdiction over many Congregations is not the pattern of Presbyteriall Elders over many. For the Apostles power was universall over all Churches, and upon that was founded their power over those Congregations supposed many; And Episcopacy may as strongly argue and infer, that because in Crete(by Apostolical warrant) one man [Titus] did ordain Elders, &c. That therefore there may be one man [a Bishop] that hath power to ordain, &c. in and over several Churches. And this Argument wil be stronger from the instance

instance of an Evangelist for Episcopall power, then this of Apostolicall government, for the Presbyteriall, by how much it is the more inferior Office, but that of the Apostles is more immediate and transcendent, and so the power of an Evangelist is necere to an ordinary succession; and it will as well follow, that any one Presbyter alone might govern many Congregations, because one of these Apostles might, as that because the Apostles did govern these joyatly, that therefore many Presbyters over severall Congregations may.

Secondly, each of these Apostles, as he had by vertue of his Apostolicall Commission the power of them all, so he had relation of Ministery unto all these supposed Congregations, unto every person thereof for the performance of all sorts of duties, of preaching to them, admonishing them, &c. But thus in the Presbyteriall government over many Congregations sixed, and their Pastors and Elders fixed to them, the severall Elders are denied to have the relation of Elders to each Congregation, but make up only an Eldership in common as united over all these. But the Apostles here have the relation to both. And therefore if this Apostolicall frame be made a Pattern, then it follows that all the Elders of these Congregations were directly and immediatly Elders to each Congregation and every member of them, and not only of a common Presbytery, for a the Apostles were.

If it be alleaged that those acts of government, performed by them in that Church, were for the substance of them ordinary Acts, such as Presbyters perform, and that therefore answerably their persons themselves are in them to be considered as Elders, because that the Apostles were not only Apostles, but Elders also, as 2 Ioh. 1. & I Pct. 5. 1. and therefore might and did act as Elders in ordinary acts of Church government, & are therfore therein to be look't at, as a just pattern to us, & to have ruled these Congregations of Ierusalem as a Colledge or body of Elders united, condescending so to act as common Presbyters taking the consent of the Church, as Act. 6. as likewise they did in every Church where they came joyning with the Eldership thereof, as Elders, and

of an ordinary Presbytery, especially seeing that what they thus did, they did as an united body to many Congregations considered as one Church.

not as Apostles, and therefore that they might give a pattern, and Example

It is answered to the first, that although the Apostles are called Elders, yet they are so called virtually, not formally, and but because Apostleship contains all Offices in it; so as they are Elders but upon this ground, that they are Apostles: and therefore John in that very Epistle

where

where he stiles himself an Elder, he yet writes Canonicall Scripture as an Apostle, and takes on him to threaten Diotrephes, as an Apostle, to remember him, which as a formall Elder he could not have done; and furely those Offices which Christ distinguisheth, Ephes. 4. He gave some Apostles, some Pastors and Teachers, the same person is not formally both, though virtually he may be. All that they did in that Church of ferusalem they are said to act As APOSTLES, their preaching is called the A-POSTLES DOCTRINE, their bringing their monies to them, as to the Officers of that Church, is to them not as Elders, but as Apostles, They laid it down at the APOSTLES FEET; yea in that Act of ordaining the 7 Descons, it is faid, they fet them A FOR E THE APOSTLES (c.6.6.) erthey laid on their hands; And it is very hard to distinguish and say that the men were Apostles, but the power they acted by, was as Elders, when the name of an Apostle imports the Office. Yea in that the very Ast of government about Deacons they must needs act as Apostles: for they do not simply ordain the men, but do anew, by vertue of Apostolical authority, institute the Office of Deacons by declaring Christs mind, which none but Apostles could immediatly and at first have done; so as the same persons in this same Act instanced in, must act partly as Apostles, and partly as El-

ders, and by what infallible rule shall we distinguish?

To the second, viz. That they afted here as it were in a joint body or in Collegio over these many Congregations. It is answered, that an Association of Elders in an Eldership over many is not argued from hence. For first, they had all fingly the same power which they exercised joyntly, and that they should exercise it joyntly here to that end to give a pattern for Eldersbip, is not easie to prove. They exercised it together, because it fell out that they were together; and it was fit none of them should be excluded: but it depended not upon this union of all in a body, as Acts of Elders in a Presbytery do. As Parliamentary power is not the refult of Parliament men, but as assembled in Parliament; yea and the authority of Iurisdiction thence ariseth: not so here, One Apostle might have done that which all here did. Yea may it not be said that because two Apostles, Paul & Barnabas, ordained Elders in every Church, Act. 14. as joyned in the same Act, and so acting not as Apostles, but joyntly, that therefore two Elders associated may do the like? Secondly, it is hard to suppose that these Apostles, when all together, should act with an inferior power to what they put forth in a like case alone. If Peter had been himself alone in a Church new planted; then, and there, he must be supposed to act as an Apostle, because he alone governed: And shall these Apostles. when they are all in one and joyne all together in one Act, be yet suppo-

E

fed to fall lower in their power under the formall exercise of it? Thirdly, if they had acted as Elders in a Colledge, they might miscarry as Elders doe; and so the minor part of them have been subject to Excommunication of the greater. And what power was there on earth to have excommunicated an Apostle who held his Office immediatly from Christ, and who whilst he was in that Office had power over all Churches?

To the third, viz. That they in their proceedings did joyne With others. As in this choice of the Deacons they did joyne with the multitude, as also when they came to any other Churches they used to do. Neither doth that argue, that they acted not as Apostles, but as Elders. For first, they joyned in Acts with others, and joyned others with themselves, wherein they yet afted as Apostles; thus in writing Scripture they joyned others with them, as Paul joyned Silvanus and Timotheus in his Epistle to the Thesfalonians; and not meerly in the falutation, for the expressions run in their names also in that Epistle. And Act. 15. The Apostles, Elders, yea and Brethren joyned in a Letter to the Churches; But these as Apostles (therefore so called in distinction from the Elders) and the rest according to their severall interests: as the Brethren did all according to their interests, so the Elders and the Apostles in theirs. So in ordaining Timothy the Presbytery laid on hands, yet they as a Presbytery and Paul as an Apostie: for else a Presbytery had not had power to ordain an Evangelift. Yet secondly, the Apostles did where ever they came leave the Elders and people to the exercise of that right belonged to them, although they joyned with them; neither did therein lie their Apostolicall authority, to doe all alone; for then they seldome or never acted as Apostles in Churches: Paul alone excommunicated not that Corinthian, and yet as an Apostle wrote to have it done by them, (for it was Canonicall Scripture) and therefore although that this Church of ferusalem should chuse their Deacons, is a just example of the priviledge of a Church (for if the Apostles when they were present allowed this interest to Churches, then Elders should much more) yet what the Apostles did by an Apostoticall power in these Congregations, cannot be drawn into example for Officers, in that thing wherein their power Apostolicall lay, which was to exercise acts of jurisdiction in severall Churches.

Neither fourthly, will that help it, That they exercised this Government in these Congregations (supposed many) as considered to be one Church. For if they acted not as Elders, then the correlate to it, namely, Church, could

not be considered as Presbyteriall.

## Reasons against the fourth and last Proof of the second Branch, viz.

That the Elders did meet together for Acts of Government, Act. 11.ult. & 15.4.6.22. & 21.17,18.

First, the Argument from Act. 11. ult. lies thus, There were Elders in Iudea that received Almes, v. 29.30. compared: Therefore the Elders of Ierusalem did meet together of Acts for Government. In this Argument, as the persons are mistaken, so the Act: for the Elders of ferusalem are not mentioned, but of Judea, as by comparing v. 29. 30. it appears. And by this it might be as well argued, that the Elders in Judea met for Presbyteriall Government, as that the Elders of ferusalem; seeing their Almes were carried to the Elders of Judea, as it is there said. The receiving Almes (which is the only Act that is mentioned) was not an Act of Government, for Deacons may meet to receive Almes, and yet

meet not for Acts of government.

For that second place mentioned, Act. 21. 20. where it is said, Paul came to Iames, and all the Elders were present: although we read that all the Elders were present, yet that they met for Acts of Presbyteriall government, appears not; the occasion of the meeting was Pauls entertainment, whom some of the Brethren had received at his first coming, v. 17. and now the Elders meet to receive him also. A Christian duty of love and respect due to so great and famous an Apostle. And Paul went not as cited, but to vifit and salute them, as v. 19. Secondly, the Acts that passed were none of them Presbyteriall, for Paul gave them an Historicall relation of what things God had wrought by his Ministery, the matter of which relation was intended to provoke them as Brethren and fellowlabourers, to glorifie God (as v. 20. is said they did) and not to give them an account, as to a Confistory, that met for Government. Such narrations the Apostles made even to whole Churches, as Paul and Barnabas at Antioch, Act. 14.27. When they had gathered the whole Church together (which Church was of no more then to meet in one Assembly ) they rehearfed in like manner, as here, all that God had done by them: and how he had opened a dore of Faith to the Gentiles. Neither will the advice they gave to Paul to prevent the scandall and offence the people would take at him, argue authority, much lesse government: Neither was there any Act of Government put forth over their own Churches if supposed: many. Reasons

## Reasons against the alledging, A&. 15. for the meeting of the Elders of Jerusalem, For Presbyteriall Acts of Government.

1. If it were a meeting of Elders for Alls of Government, then it was a Presbyteriall meeting for Acts of Government: But that it was no fuch meeting appears, because there was nothing done in it, that may seem to have any bond in it, but such as bound the Churches of Antioch, Syria, Cilicia, as much as ferusalem, but this cannot be any Presbyterial meeting, for Alls of Government: For such meetings have only authoritative

pomer over their own Church.

2. The scope and end of this meeting was to give satisfaction to the of-fended Brethren of Antioch, and dogmatically to declare their judgements in a difficult case of Conscience, not to put forth any Act of suridicall power upon any, as appears in the matter of their debate, and the issue of all. Of which more fully afterward. And if it be said that Peter reproved some of their own Members present, such as had taught the necessity of the Ceremoniall Law, Why tempt you God, &c. This was not delivered as an Act of Government formally, by any vote of the Presbytery, but in the way of Discourse.

"But it was affirmed to be Sufficient to confirme the Proposition, if it be a

" Synodicall meeting.

Presbyteriall and Synodicall, both it cannot be. For Synods, they are (or ought to be) extraordinary and occusionall: Presbyteries are standing and ordinary. Synods are made up of Commissioners sent from Presbyteries, and Presbyteries are made up of the Elders of particular Congregations. The Members of Synods are Elders of fuch Churches which are (according to the principles of Presbyteriall Government) compleat Churches, having full power of jurisdiction for all Acts of Government within themselves; but the members of Presbyteries are Elders of such Congregations which are neither compleat Churches, nor have within themselves full and compleat power. And these cannot be one. The Elders of the Presbytery at ferusalem, (when this once became a Synod by the addition of the Elders of other Churches) ceased to be any longer a Presbytery to that Church, and must become with them a new body to all the Churches, these other Elders did come from. And then to argue these Acts done by these (because the Elders of ferusalem were present and Members of this Synod) were Presbyteriall Acts of the Elders of ferusalem, is all one

00-

as to go about to argue from the Alts of Government put forth by a Parliament at Westminster, to the power of the Burgesses and Common Councell of the City of Westminster, because there the Parliament sits, and the Burgesses of that City are parts and members of that Parliament. Or, as if all the Kingdome were governed by County Courts; and out of those County Courts, Knights, and Burgesses should be chosen to make up a Parliament, when the Parliament is met, there can be no Argument drawn from the power of a Parliament to prove the power of a County Court. Or from the power of a County Court to prove the power of a Parliament. Thus Synods are made out of Presbyteries, therefore we cannot argue from the power of Presbyteries to the power of Synods.

But secondly, we deny it to have been such an ordinary formall Synod. The jurisdiction of Synods is founded upon this necessary requisite thereunto, That there be Commissioners from all those Churches representing them, present, or called to be so. And the power of the jurisdiction cannot reach nor extend further then to such Churches as have sent Commissioners thereunto. The weight then of this Synodicall power depends on the proof of this, That all those Churches sent Commissioners to this Assembly, which if either it be not proved, or the contrary thereunto found true, the authority of those decrees (as from those Elders here) will prove, not to have been Astronoment, further then the Apostles authority, who joyned in it, was stamped on it. To affirme that Commissioners from them all were present, because the decrees did bind them, is to begge what is denyed, when another just reason may be given of their binding, if any such authority were in them: and our Reasons to the contrary are these.

First, We find a deep silence about it: For we read but only of two Churches between whom it was transacted, they of Antioch sending to Jerusalem, and their Elders there, Chap. 14.27,28. compared with chap. 15.2,3. and the Messengers which were sent from this Assembly going only to Antioch, v. 30,31. as those who were chiefly troubled; only the benefit redounded to all they wrote to: yea, although Paul came through Phenice and Samaria, ver. 3. yet we read not a word of any of the Churches of those parts, their sending of any Commissioners unto this Synod, as had it been intended such, certainly they would: and there was this speciall reason, why those of this Church were thus electively sent unto, because they were the Mother Church from whom the Word of God came, and from whom those men that troubled them had gone forth, and had pretended to teach what they had received from them; and besides they were in an especiall manner versed in this question, it being about the

observation of their law; and there also some of the Apostles were present, (how many we know not, for dispersed they had been long before) and if any number of others out of those other parts of fudea, had come up hither, it would have been said, as Act. 11. ult. The Elders of fudea, not onely of ferusalem; yea, it is not so much as said, that they, that were sent from Antioch, were of the Elders of that Church, but that they sent Paul and Barnabas, and certaine others of them.

And secondly, the contrary seemes cleere: namely, that those Letters and Decrees were written and fent onely from the Elders of ferusalem, and not from all those Churches: For first, the Decrees are every where attributed to the Elders in ferusalem, So Chap. 16. 4. The Decrees of the Apostles and Elders in ferusalem. πρεσουτέρων της εν ίεροσαλήμ. Now the usuall stile of the New Testament, is by way of distinction of Churches to fay the Church in such a place, the Elders in such a place, as the Church of Antioch, Act. 13. 1. and the Church at Corinth, I Cor. 1. 1. and by the like reason the Elders in such a place do signific the proper Elders of the Church in that place or City, whilest but one, and therefore, if by the Elders in Jerusalem, had been meant in this place onely the Elders met from all Quarters at Jerusalem, as the place of that Assembly, there had been a great ambiguity, seeing the more usuall and proper import of that expression is to note out the fixed standing Elders of a place, and the Church in a place. Again, secondly, in the fourth verse Paul and Barnabas are said to be received of the Church and Apostles and Elders, namely of ferusalem, as in particular relation to it. Yea, thirdly, the standing Elders of that place assumed to themselves to have written the Decrees. Chap. 21. 25. As touching the Gentiles wee have written and concluded. Fourthly, and accordingly the conclusion of their Letter is made the speciall Act of that Church, and the Elders thereof, ver. 22. It pleased the Apostles and Elders with the whole Church (that is) of ferusalem, as ver. 4. to send chosen men, and the Letters run thus, The Apostles, Elders and Brethren. Fifthly, the matter of the Letter argues it, v.24. For a smuch as certain that went out from us have troubled you with words, to whom we gave no such commandement. How could this be said by a Synod of the Elders of thole Churches, which were themselves troubled by them? It is manifest therefore they came out from this Church of Jerusalem, who wrote this, and they pretended the Apostles Doctrine; which is called a Commandement, because the Apostles taught no other, then what Christ commanded, as Mat. 28. ult. And to fay the Denomination was from the more eminent part, namely, the Elders of that Church had been derogatory to the Synod, if it had been such a meeting. And sixthly, if the Elders

ders of all those Churches had been present, there had been lesse need for the Apostles and Elders of Ferusalem to have fent chosen men to carry the Letters, and withall to shew the grounds of those their judgements by word of mouth, ver. 23.27.31. This needed not, if their own Elders had been present, and so had been to have returned; and if they were fent as Messengers from the Synod, then to all the Church's as well as to Antioch, and why doe they then go no further then unto Antioch? ver. 33. Yea, and although Paul and Barnabas delivered those results to all the Cities, yet, as it should seem accidentally and not Principally intended, they goe not on purpose chiefely to deliver those decrees, but ver. 36. of Chap. 15. it was Pauls motion upon other grounds to go visit the Churches in every City, where they had Preached, and so but occasionally delivered these Decrees, Chap. 16.4. So as they came to them, not as sent in a mandatory way, as to Churches subject to that Synod by a Synodicall Law, (as such Canons are used to be sent) but as the judgement onely of this Church; and the Apostles delivered them for their edification.

And in the third place, If there were any further authority or jurifdi-Etion in their Decrees, it was from the Apostles, who were present and concurred in it, and who had power over all the Churches. And accordingly though the Elders in the whole Church were present and joyned with the Apostles, Quantum in se, to consent and approve their Decrees with that severall respective kinde of judgment proper unto them, yet all the authority put forth over these Churches was that transcendent authority of the Apostles, which is not now left in all the Elders of the world joyned together; and that therefore these Decrees made, and the decision of these questions here, were by infallible Apostolicall authority: And to that end they subjoyeed that Apostolicall Seale, It seemed good to us and the holy Ghoft. And although the ordinary Elders, yea, and the whole Church joyned in this, yet but according to their Measure, Analogie, and Proportion of their faith, (even as in writing some Epistles Timothy and Silvanus joyned with Paul, but yet Paul onely wrote Apostolically, and the authority in them is looked at as his; ) or else because perhaps they having the holy Ghost falne on them through the Apostles Doctrine then delivered, (which was then usuall) perswading their hearts unanimously (though afore diffenting, as ver. 25.) to accord; in that respect they might speak this in such a sense, that no assembly of men wanting Apostolicall presence and instruction, may now speak. And although it may be objected, That then this Letter and these Decrees should bee formall Scripture, and so binde us still, it is answered; That they are Scripture, and written for our learning; and if the case were the same upon which they obliged rhem them then, (viz. matter of offence) that then they would binde us now: but the things being enjoyned, but as imairance, things of a super-added casuall necessity and not absolute, in case of offence onely and not simply for the things themselves, therefore now the necessity being ceased, the obligation ceaseth: yet so as the equity of the rule and ground these were commanded upon, to abstain from things that offend our brethren doth hold in like cases to the end of the world.

And last of all, there is no act of such authority & government put forth, in it, which the Proposition intendeth; which will appear, if we either con-

sider the occasion and rise of it, or the issue and result of it.

It was not a fet stated meeting by common agreement of the Churches, but Antioch sends to ferusalem unknown to them; there are no summons sent to send up Delinquents, nor can we finde these disturbers are fent to ferusalem to be censured by those Ecclesiasticall punishments. in which Government doth properly lie and confift; The subject matter sent to them for their decision was meerly matter of Doctrine, about this question, verse 2. and about this word, verse 5. Namely, whether the Ceremoniall Law was to be observed? Concerning which they wrote their judgements dogmatically, which they were called to doe, being thus sent unto. Neither doth it argue that it was more then to determine this question doctrinally they came up for, because that Paul and Barna-. bas could have decided that before, (being themselves Apostles) and that therefore their comming up was for discipline against Delinquents: for as the case stood, they listned not to Paul and Barnabas as Apostles, but pretended the judgement of the other Apostles; For indeed Paul and Barnabas did declare their judgements, (The salors, or contention, ver. 3. being attributed unto them as contending against the false Teachers for the Truth) and so as even the Church of Antioch rested not in their decision: Otherwise Paul and Barnabas might have as Apostles censured those Delinquents without comming to fernfalem, as well as by Apostolique authority have decided the question: For Apostolicall power extended to Discipline as well as Doctrine. If it be said, That even do-Elrinally to deliver the truth when it is done by a company of Elders, bath Authority or Power in it, as when Christ said, Goe and teach, all power is given me: It is granted an Authority exercised in doctrine and so to be in Synods, but yet not furifdiction, which the Propofition intends, which is when doctrines are delivered sub pana, under the penalty of that Ecclesiastical punishment of Excommunication if not received. One Minister alone hath a dogmaticall authority as a Minister to rebuke, exhort, and yet acts of furisdiction are not his alone, but of others conjoyned with him. Neither.

Neither, secondly, doth the titles given to these results of theirs argue a furisdiction in that they are called ni Soquara and ni xexpressia Act. 16. 4. For although the word of year is used for an Imperial decree, Luk. 2.1. yet but rarely, & more commonly (as Stephanus and Budaus observe) for dollrine and opinions in matters morall or speculative, as Platonis Dogma, &c. and thence is translated to import the Judgements of Divines given, in matters Theologicall, although delivered with certainty. And so the using of this word implyeth the Subject to have been doctrinal onely and so delivered. And further the Subject matter of this decision being about rules and ceremonies, and the not observation of them, the [Dogma] is elegantly, and perhaps on purpose, given to these Apostolical Canons by way of opposition and contradiction to those that taught and observed such rules, who are said soquerily in so doing, Colos. 2. 20. being led away by the false Dogmata, or Heterodox these of false Teachers that enjoyned them. And for that other word respected translated fordained, ] it plainly notes out but this, that these doctrinal Theses were the joyne declared and avowed Judgement and conclusions of these (and so answereth to those other words in their letters, [It seemed good unto us, being with one accord, &c. ] Apostles and Elders thus met with one accord agreeing therein, and particularly, & unanimously fo judging; and therefore when fames gives his judgement he useth the same word xiva (Vers. 19. of this 15. Chap.) This is my judgement, which being voted and agreed upon by the rest they are called xexplosia. Netrher doth this argue any act of authority that the things here declared to be observed are indifferent, for some of them come under a morall confideration, and all come under the case of offence.

Neither doth the language they commend these to them in, sound of that Jurisdiction or government intended in the Proposition; for although they seeme to speak as guided infallibly in their resolution, it seemeth good to us and to the holy Ghoft ] yet their expressions are carryed so, as to avoid furisdiction. Those words, To lay no other burthen ] if any, mult import this furifdiction; but these words, as Ludovicus de Dien hath well observed, are (as they may be) taken passively, therein agreeing with the Syriack translation; It seemeth good to us & the holy Ghoft that no other burthen be laid on you: That whereas these Teachers of the circumcision had gone about by their doctrine to bind the Law of Moses upon mens consciences, and to put on them aburthen too heavy for them to bear, as Peter speaks Vers. 9. and had taught this to be the command of Christ and his Apostles, and the judgement of the Church of ferusalem; They disclaime this, and professe they would have no such burthen put upon them, and they gave these Teachers no such commandement, that is, never delivered or uttered any such Doctrine to be commanded. And if it be taken actively, yet the declaring it to be the command of Christ is the imposition here intended, for the same words are used of the Teachers, who yet had not assumed by vertue of

an Ecclefissicall authority to impose these things, but by way of Dostrine, So Verse the tenth, Why tempt you God to put a yoak upon the neck of the Disciples? Vers. And it is well known that in the Scripture phrase to teach and to declare, though by way of Doctrine, and to presse mens consciences with things as the commands of God, is said to be a binding and imposing a burthen on them. So of the Pharisees (and these were of the sect of the Pharisees, of whom, and to whom that was spoken, Verse 5.) it is said, Matth. 23. 4. that the Pharisees bind heavy burthens & grievous to be borne, and lay them on mens shoulders; which is spoken but of a Doctrinall declaring and pressing mens consciences with the rigour of the Law; and this is so well known to be the Language of the Jewes, that it need not be insisted on.

Neither doth it follow that if they may lay these burthens by way of Doctrine, they may censure for the neglect of them, for every Minister in his Sermon imposeth those burthens, whilst they urge & declare these duties to men, and yet have not power Ecclesiastically to censure them. For though, it being a command of Christ, they could not but hold it forth as such and so urge it; yet not by way of Jurisdiction, but with these soft words, [which if you observe

you doe well.

Lastly, although these salse Teachers had subverted their faith, and, against their own light, had vouched their Doctrine to be the Doctrine of the Apostles, which deserved the highest censure being a sin so scandalous, yet they proceeded not to censure them, by way of admonition or excommunication (which are acts of government) but onely do declare their sinne and errour, and give their Judgement of it.

Reasons

### REASONS,

Against the two last Assertions of the Assembly, concerning the instance of the Church of Ferusalem.

Affertion.

Whether these Congregations be fixed or not fixed, in regard of Officers or Members, It is all one as to the truth of the Proposition.

#### Our Reply.

Hereas in the close of the proofe from the Church of Jerusalem, for many Congregations to be under one Presbyterial Government, it is afferted:

Whether these Congregations be fixed or not fixed, it is all one as to the truth of

the Proposition.

This Reason is offered against it.

There is this Difference. Every Congregation having Elders fixed to it, is a CHURCH; for the relation of Elders & Church is mutuall, Acts 14.23. They ordained Elders in every Church. This relation of Elders to a Church is a spesiall distinct relation to that Congregation of which they are Elders, so, as they are not related to other Congregations. And these Congregations are Ecclesia prima; Churches formed up though uncompleat, as being according to our brethrens opinion, members of a more general Presbyterial Church. But if Congregations baveno fixed Officers, they are not Churches according to their Principles.

Now it makes a great difference as to the truth of the Proposition, whether many Churches may be under the government of one, or whether many Congregations (which to them are no Churches) may be under the government of one? Whatsoever our Bretbren shew of divers Congregations to be under the government of a Church Presbyteriall, yet they no where shew any one patterne or example in Scripture wherein many Churches were under the power of one,

nay, nor where any one Church was under the power of another.

Affertion.

That there appeares no materiall difference betwixt the severall Congregations in Ferusalem, and the many Congregations now in the ordinary condition of the Church, as to the point of fixednesse, in regard of Officers and Members.

#### Our Reply.

And lastly, if there were many. Congregations in fernsalem, having their Officers fixed to them, and not in common, then during the time before the dispersion, the Apostles must be those Officers, that were thus fixedly disposed

of to those severall Congregations, some over one, others over another, as ordinary Elders Now are. Now suppose this number of Beleevers to have been as many thousands as is argued, as 10. or 1 2000. soules, and these to be divided into as many Congregations as might be divided to twelve Apostles, severally to watch over; Or suppose the severall Congregations made up of 2000. (which is an alotment small enough to be set apart for the paines of two

Apostles.) Hereupon THIS great incongruity doth follow: that Apostles are brought to the state and condition and work of Parish Ministers: To whom, yet it was committed, and inseparably annexed to their Office, yea, and constituted it, as Apostles to have the care of all Churches; and if when the Churches were multiplyed and dispersed into severall Countries, they were to have the care of them, then much more when they were in one City. Some of the writers against Episcopacy, (when those that write for it, alledge the instance of James abiding at Jerusalem, as the Bishop of that Church) have judged it a debasing of the Apostolical power to limit it to one Diocesan Church : but this position doth debase all the Apostles at once much more, it makes them not Bishops to many Churches, but ordinary Elders; in that one or two of them (perhaps) are over one single Church: yea, & which is yet more incredible, if these Churches & their government were like to those under the Presbytery, and no materiall difference between them and ours, these Apostles were in their Parishes not onely subordinate in their government to the common Presbytery of all the Apostles, but limited to lesser Acts of Government: For so the lesser Elderthips in the Churches under the Presbyteriall government are; confined onely to examine, & admonish, and prepare for the greater Presbytery, and therein not enabled to ordaine Elders over the Congregation, or excommunicate a member: Peter and John joyned together mere by this principle not enabled to it. And yet, if we doe not suppose such a limited government in those severall Congregations, here can be no patterne for the Presbyterian government as it is practifed. Or if otherwise, we should suppose them fixed Officers for teaching onely, to one of those Congregations, and to have no government at all over it, but to bring all to the common Presbytery of Apostles, that is a greater incongruity then the former: for this casts them below the condition of our Parish Elders, for unto them, the greater Presbytery doth allow some meafure and part of the Government, but such a supposition would allow Apofles, none, in their severall Congregations.

#### Other R E A S O N S against the maine Proposition,

The Scriptures holds forth, That many Congregations may be under one PRESEYTERIALL GOVERNMENT.

By particular Congregations either first an Assembly of Christians meeting for worship onely, as to hear, pray,&c. or secondly, an Assembly so furnished with Officers as sit for Discipline having a Presbytery, is meant; in the latter sense, which is that the proofs are brought to confirme, and that that is practised where this government is set up, the proposition is equivalent to such an affertion as this; Many Presbyteries may be under Presbyteriall government, as thus, Parochiall Presbyteries may be under one Classicall, many Classicall, under one Provinciall,&c. which is the same as to affirme that one Presbytery may be over another. As the Bishops affirm, That one Presbyter may be over a congregation that is composed of a Presbytery of people: for it cannot be said to be over a Congregation, if it be over the people onely, that is not over their Presbytery also, For then the Presbytery will be Independent, and the people under two Presbyteries coordinate and not subordinate, which stands not with common reason.

This then being the Affertion, it is thus ARGUED AGAINST. A Presbytery over a Presbytery, or power over power necessarily implyeth ewo forts of Presbyteries, or Ecclesiasticall Jurisdictions, specially distinct or at least more then numerically. A greater or leffer vary not the kind in a Physicall or Theologicall consideration, but in a Politicall it doth: He that hath a greater power then I have, that is a power over my power, a power to order, direct or correct the power I have, this mans power and mine differ as two forts or kinds of power. And although this superior Presbytery be made up of Presbyters fent as Commissioners from the congregationall or parochiall Presbyteries, yet this hinders not at all but that they may be thus distinct: For some Cities and townes corporate, their Officers are fent up, and fit as Members of Parliament, yet this Honourable House hath a power distinct, and superiour to that which is in London or Yorke: though the superior Presbytery be made up of Presbyters from severall Congregations, yet it is made up of Presbyteries, it hath the persons materially considered, but not that power formally confidered: for as while the Parliament sits and certain Burgesses from Burrough townes sit as Members in it, these Townes notwithstanding still retaine all the power those Corporations were ever involted with, so particular Congregations whilst some of their Elders sit in the Classicall Presbytery, have Elderships or a Presbytery still. Now that it is very probable I.

II.

the Scriptures hold not forth Two Sorts Of PRESBYTERIES

Thus Specifically Distinct, may be thus argued.

First, where the Scripture holds forth distinct forts in any kind, there will be found either distinct and proper names and titles, or at least some adjunct or difference added to that which is common or generall; In the Apostles times there were Presbyters over Presbyters, Apostles were superior to Prophets, and Prophets a distinct order from Teachers; Therefore in 1 Cor. 12: God hath fet some in the Church: First Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers, after that Miracles, then gifts of Healing, &c. They have not only particular names and titles, but special notes of distinction added, agator atostas, secondarily of the Moon, and Stars of Heaven, are all called Lights, yet there are termes of difference added, they are called first, great Lights, and then the greater to rule the day, and the lesser to rule the night.

Throughout the New Testament we find this word πρεσβυτεειδυ, but in three places, whereof there is but one that holdeth out the Government in hand, and in that place you have the naked word only without the addition of any such expression, greater, lesser, superiour, inferior, or any kind of adjunct, that can possibly put a thought in us, of more Presbyteries then one. Notwithstanding so usefull are peculiar distinct names where there are distinct sorts or kinds of admiration, as it is not omitted by any Church in their Ordinances for Government; in Scotland the lowest is termed a Consistory, the next a Classis or Presbytery, the third a Provincial Synod, the fourth a Generall Assembly. The French in these termes, Consistories, and Colloquells and Synods: so in the Episcopall Re-

publique there was the like variety.

Secondly, As the Scriptures hold forth nothing in any title or name to distinguish, no more can we thence discover any fores of Government different in nature; for triall of this, let it be supposed there is a Parochiall or Consistorian Presbytery for one fort, there is another fort we call Classicall, what Scripture gives light by any kind of reasoning to warrant the setting up one of those above, or over the other? Doe you read any where God hath set in his Church, first Presbyteries, secondarily, Classes, then Consistories? Or is there any thing in the word directing a different composition or constitution in these?

First, For the materiale, the Persons that these Presbyteries are made up of, are the same; The Consistory hath gifted men set a part to the Office of the Ministry; Those that are in a Classicall Presbytery are no otherwise qualified, nor indeed doth the Scripture require any thing but a Presbyteration to qualifie men for any sort, if there were sorts of Presbytery.

That, there is a greater number of Presbyters in the one then in the

other,

other this alters not the state in respect of the matter; for if the number be competent, that is, so many as two or three may agree, Mat. 18. it sufficeth. The Honourable House of Commons, is to all Parliamentary purposes as much a House, when but two or three above forty, as when foure hundred. Nor doth this alwayes fall out that all Classicall Presbyteries have a greater number then some Parochiall. Scriptures have determined neither how few will constitute a Classicall Presbytery, nor how many may be in a Parochial: Practice many times makes them equall.

Secondly, Now for the Formale, the uniting of this matter into a Confession or Catus. Presbyters become united into a Presbytery in the Classicall, by having Pastorall charges in such a division, whosoever commeth so to be disposed of, he is no sooner Pastor to such a Parish, but he is eo nomine, Member of such a Classis. The Presbyters of a Prochiall Presbytery are as neerly united and more: They are united in the choice and call of the same Congregation they govern, & united in the whole work of the Ministery over the same people; so that they are not only fellow Governours, but fellow Labourers in the same Vineyeard. There is therefore no just ground for such a distinction of difference between Pre bytery and

Presbytery in respect either of the MATTER or the FORM.

Thirdly, Nor thirdly, do we find any thing in the Scriptures making them, as from different imployments, or functions, to differ; first, we pretend and so it is in the proposition, the one is superiour, the other inferiour; But how can you say the Scriptures have made this difference, when there is not a word spoken this way in any place? Presbyterian Writers themselves in some expressions seeme to take away utterly such difference as this; in one place you shall read the Classis can doe nothing, renitente Ecclesia, but it is null and invalid; Thus the Assertion for Discipline, and avouches Zepperus, Zanchy, and others as of this opinion. The Congregation, though but minima Ecclesiola, yet may reforme, that is, suppend, excommunicate, &c. Renitentibus correspondentis. So Voetius in his Theses, & desperata causa Papatus, lib. 2. Sect. c. 12. Surely according to what these Reverend Divines have expressed, it is hard to be said, which of these Presbyteries hath the greater or superiour power:

Secondly, the imployment or work of a Presbytery is to ordaine, excommunicate, suspend, admit Members, appoint times for worship and the like. The Classical Presbytery reserve ordination, & excommunication to themselves, but the other are left to Parochial Presbytery. Thus some Presbyterians divide the work, Other's possibly otherwise. But how can we affirme any such designment from the Scriptures, if you have not two sorts, either in name or nature to be found there? and none of these Asts or Administrations but may be done by that one, the Scripture mentioneth, which doubtlesse they may, seeing Ordination seemeth

III.

to be specifyed in the Text; if the greater, then doubt lesse the lesser. The Pastor in one place is said to exhort, in another to comfort, in another to visit the sicke, this will not warrant distinct sorts of Pastors, for there being but one sort spoken of in Scriptures, we must interpret all these several

Administrations to belong to that one.

It was not found an easie work in this Assembly to finde two sorts of Elders, teaching, and ruling. Notwithstanding all the Scripture hath said of these, and in some places, so plaine, as if of purpose to distinguish them. If it be so hard a matter by Scripture light to hold forth two sorts of Presbyteries, it must needs be more difficult to find out two sorts of Presbyteries, especially seeing (as it is generally granted, and this by the Presbyterians themselves) that for above fifty yeares after Christ, and in the Apostles times, there was but one kinde of Presbytery.

It hath been the wisdome of States to keep and preserve the bounds and limits of their Judicatures evident, and distinct, and as free from controversie as may be. If Laws and Ordinances about matters of meum and tuum, and such inferiour claimes should not be so evident, the authority of these Courts will be in a readinesse to relieve wrongs and injuries through such mistakings. But Controversies and classings about these high and publique interests are no other in the issue then the dividing of

a Kingdome within it self.

Is man wiser in his Generation then fesus Christ? He is our Law-giver, the Government is laid upon his shoulders; he is the wonderfull Councellor, the Prince of Peace. And therefore surely though other matters of practice and duty should have obscurity in the rule, Yet it is most probable, He hath ordered Authority and Jurisdiction with the Officers and Offices for the managing of it, so evident, as not to put us to search in a dark corner for directions. We cannot be said to be cleer in our rule when we are thus inforced out of one word, and but once used, to raise so many Thrones, or Formes of Government, especially it being foreseen by Christ that such is the nature of man as nothing occasions more bitter contention then that susting which is in us to have Authority and Jurisdiction over others.

Sic subscribitur:

Tho. Goodwin, Will
Philip Nye, Will
fer. Burroughes, Will
Sidrach Sympson.

William Bridge, William Greenhill, William Carter.

Concordat cum Originali.

Adoniram Byfield, Scriba.



# ANSWER

ASSEMBLY of DIVINES,

UNTO

The Reasons of the seven dissenting Brethren, against the Proposition of divers Congregations being united under one Presbyteriall GOVERNMENT.

And first, to their first and maine Argument. Concerning which we observe: First, That

His first maine Argument is equally strong against all Government by Synods, which the whole Christian Church hath ever acknowledged unto this day.

Secondly, it is as strong (though they intended

it not) against Elders doing any act of Elders out of their own particular Congregation, what need soever there be of it: So that if any particular

Congregation cannot preserve it selfe, it must be left in corruption and to perdition, rather then any Act of the Elders of an other Congregation may be exercised for their relief, by any Ecclesialtical

clesiasticall or Presbyteriall power: As suppose a Minister should administer the Sacrament in another Congregation upon any exigent, all the incongruities and absurdities of this Argument fall upon him. 1. It may be alledged against him, Then he must stand in relation to them as an Elder of that flock; Church and Elder are Relata, as well as Church and Elders, and then he must watch over their Soules, &c. Then his whole work must be example; then may he rule them, his Preaching and ruling power must be commensurable; then may they challenge to elect him, then may the Deacons of his Parish come and collect Almes among them, &c. And so of all the rest of the Incongruities, and disproportions. This Argument therefore carrying with it so much mischief to the whole Church, must needs be false either in the major, or minor, or both, which to discover, we premise these few pracognita.

First, The whole Church of Christ is but one, made up of the Collection and aggregation of all who are called out of the world by the Preaching of the Word, to professe the Faith of Christ, unto the unity thereof: From which union there ariseth unto every one such a relation unto, and dependance upon the Catholike Church, as parts have to the whole, and are to do all Christian duties, as parts conjoyned unto the whole, and Members of the same Common-wealth and Corporation,

Eph. chap. 4. ver. 3, to 14.

Secondly, All the Ministers and Officers of the Church are given to the whole Church for the gathering and building of it, I Cor. chap. 12. ver. 28. Eph. chap. 4. ver. 11, 12. And they are all to teach and rule, and perform all other ministrations with reference to it, and the best advantage of it.

Thirdly, When this whole number of called men, and their Officers were no more then might meet together in one place, they taught and ruled, and did all other ministerials and Christian works in one undi-

vided body respectively.

Fourthly, Their number increasing, so that they could not with edification meet all together according to the will of Christ, they divided into severall companies for their better ordering and increase, and such severall Companies joyned together in one external fellowship and communion of the same publique Profession, and rule of Faith, worship of God, and Ecclesiastical Discipline, and practice of love, and the duties of it, are in the Scripture called Churches, and to some one of these should every believer joyn himself.

Fifthly, And being thus joyned, the Officers and Membe's should not act or work, as if they were independent Corporations, but only as parts of Christs body, and are all to regard the common good of the whole, and all things in these smaller bodies are to be mannaged

ter

for the greatest advantage of the whole, Ephesians Chap. 4. ver. I. &c. Sixthly, As it is the will of Christ, that particular Christian men and families should be affociated into some particular Assembly, for their own and others edification, so (as much as may be) should such particular Assemblies associate with other Assemblies for the common and mutuall good of them all, fometimes they standing in need of others, or others of them; fometimes themselves singly are insufficient to their own businesse; sometimes divisions grow between the people and their Elders; sometimes the people rent from their Elders; sometimes the Elders miscarry in their administrations to the people; sometimes a whole Church groweth corrupt in doctrine or conversation; sometimes it is not commodious and expedient to use their power without affiftance and counsell: in all which cases they stand in need of the help of others, and when other Congregations are in the like condition, they stand in the like need of them. Some things also being of common concernment to them all, as when sometimes error, Heresie, Schism, overrun many of these Congregations; sometimes divisions grow betwixt Church and Church; sometimes Ministers are to be translated from one Congregation to another, and many the like things fall out, which are of common concernment, and cannot be done by any of them alone: And in all such cases, and for all such ends they are tyed to associate, as much as particular men are tied to associate with a Congregation if it may be obtained, and no excuse can be pleaded for a Congregation and their Officers, which may not be pleaded for a particular person, the unity of the body of Christ being as strong for the one as for the other, and the necessity and benefits of the one as of the other.

Seventhly, In such Associations, as the mutuall consent of particular men and families orderly regulated joyning in one Congregation gives them power and authority one over another according to the rule of Christ, without hurting or destroying, but rather helping and strengthning of the Liberty of their severall persons and families: So in this Association of Congregations their mutuall consent orderly regulated gives them a sufficient call for the Elders to exercise their power of Elders (which is no where any other then ministeriall) and the people their interest in such things as are above mentioned, without impairing or hurting the liberty and privileges of the Congregations, but rather preserving and strengthning of them; this association of Congregations, as that also of Families being such a joyning as proceeds Excharitate, ex debito mutua societatis colenda, as is between friends and equals, Non ex debito inferioris conditionis ad prestandum obsequium, as between Masters and Servants. This is most cleer in the continuall intercouse held in the Churches of the New Testament betwixt B b 2 feverall feverall Churches or Congregations, one with another, even while they enjoyed the personall presence, direction and authority of the Apostles, 2 Corinthians Chapter 8. Verse 14. 19. with Romans Chapter 15. Verse 26. Colossians Chapter 4. Verse 16. Acts Chapter I 1. Verse 29, 30. Galatians Chap. 6. Ver. I, 2, 5, 9. with Galatians Chapter 1. Verse 2. Acts Chapter 13. Verse 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Acts Chapter 15. Verse 1, 3, 4. Sometimes by Letters written to many Churches as one body, fometimes by Commissioners, sometimes by Synods, sometimes in a particular matter concerning one Church. sometimes in matter of common concernment to many Churches: And it is impossible the common good of the whole Church should be preserved without these Associations: It being cleerly the will of Christ, that the Communion of Saints not only internall but also external among them all should be maintained and increased; All being tyed to strive together in one spirit, to help one another, to strengthen the weake, to admonish the unruly, to withdraw from them that walke inordinately. The institution of Christ making his Church one, and apponting all these as means proportionable to attaine that end, and no where limitting them to be as meanes to particular and individual men only; but left them to be applyed according to the present condition of times, places, persons, of one, or more, or many, whether men or Churches: The very light of nature requiring, that all due and lawfull means should be used for the attaining of some necessary end, warrants us to conclude, that the means appointed or commanded for particular Christians, should be as appliable to whole Companies of them, unlesse Gods word hath some where forbidden it. If it be demanded whether it be not left free to Congregations and their Officers, whether they will joyn in such Association or not; because their mutuall consent is that which is pleaded as the next foundation of it? We answer, It is here as it is in the case of joyning with a particular Congregation: All are injoyned to it by Christ to be Members of some Congregation; but when they joyn to this Congregation rather then to that, the mutuall consent between them, and the Congregation with whom they joyn, is that web immediately gives them that special relation to one another: So is it here, what further rules are about the regular setling of Congregations or such Asfociations as these are, what is the Magistrates power or duty in setling the bounds of Congregations or such Presbyteries, or what he hath to do with such as refuse either to associate with particular Congregations, or Classicall Presbyteries, or what the duty of the Churches is about it, belongs not to this present question, it is sufficient here to shew, that such as are willing thus to associate may see a warrant for it.

Eighthly, such proofes and evidences must be admitted by our Bre-

Dissenting Brethren, against the Instance of the Church of Jerusalem.

thren in this point, as are acknowledged and allowed by them in other parts of Church government, wherein they agree with us, which are not alwayes immediately out of Scripture sufficiently cleare to convince pertinacious adversaries; And yet the Scripture-grounds compared with light of nature are sufficient to satisfie pious and moderate men.

These things premised, we proceed to this their main Argument, viz. If many particular Congregations, having all their Officers fixed, &c.

Where first in generall we note, that they have framed this Argument only against the joyning of those many Congregations into one Presbyteriall government, who have all their Officers fixt, which is not our Proposition, nor was our instance brought to prove it: We determined not whether all Congregations can have all Officers fixed, not whether they must have them if they could, whether the severall Congregations so united must have each their own particular Presbytery, or whether they must all coalescere in unum tantum Presbyterium; Nor do we find it certain, whether in Jerusalem the officers were fixed or not fixed.

We doubt not to affirme that there may be divers Congregations joyned in one Presbytery only, and the Officers to teach and govern in Common, when it shall be found most for their edification, and so it is in some reformed Churches at this day: and the truth thereof was also acknowledged by one of these dissenting Brethren, who refused to enter his dissent against the Proposition if taken in this sense: And we doubt not also to affirm, that where there is this joyning of many Congregations, there may be distinct Presbyteries in the severall Congregations, who may have either some or all Officers sixt, and they may do what belongs to that Congregation, only so far as they are able, and their joyning into a Common Presbytery is for their helping & strengthning.

So that our Proposition may stand true, though their whole Argument were granted, and the whole strength of it is by their new framing of it appliable only against the Appendix in the instance of ferm-

salem, viz. That it is all one as to the truth of the proposition, &c.

And unlesse the fixing of Officers do wholly alter the State of the question, their argument must fall to the ground: for instance, suppose in ferusalem there were ten Congregations and twenty Officers feeding and ruling them in common, no one of them fixed to any one Congregation. This kind of Presbytery would passe for a lawfull government, and none of these incongruities or absurdicies are charged upon it by this Argument; but if they should find by experience that it would be more for the edification of the Congregations to have two of the Officers fixed to each Congregation to teach and govern them in such things which concern themselves, and yet all of them agree in a Common Colledge with mutuall advise and consent

Bb 3

to transact all things which should be of dificultie or common concernment: Such a Presbytery should make them liable to all these Incongruities and absurdities by this their Argument. Yet notwithstanding we shall examine it, as themselves have framed it, viz. If many Congregations having all Elders already fixed respectively unto them may be under a Presbyteriall government, then all those Elders must sustain a speciall relation of Elders to all the people of those Congregations as one Church, and to every one as a member thereof. But this carries with it great and manifold incongruities and inconsistences with rules of Scripture, and principles of reformed Churches themselves; therefore it may not be.

We answer, first to the consequence of the major by denying it, That in such a government, the Elders do the work of Elders, is granted, and that in that work, and because of the work there done, they bear a speciall relation of Presbytery to the Churches, is as readily granted: But that therefore they must be judged singly Elders of these Churches. tyed to do all the Offices of Elders to them as to the Congregations where they are fixed, Or that all the Congregations who joyne in fuch an Association must necessarily be one Church, one particular. First Church (asit is called) is utterly false; when many Elders of severall Congregations meet in a Synod and do fuch Acts as our Brethren grant. they may do in relation to many Congregations; We suppose they will not deny that they do these Acts of Elders as Elders: yet they are not thereby every one argued to be Elders of every one of these Congregations, or these Congregations argued to be one Church. Or when a Minister administers the Sacrament to another Congregation, or to the people of another Congregation, he doth it as an Elder, and as having a special relation to that people at that time, and in that work, he being called to it; yet it followes not that he is, or therefore must be an Elder of that Church, bound to performe all Offices of an Elder publikely and privately to every one of them.

And if it be excepted against this, that such an occasionall Att doth not indeed prove it, but to do it statedly or ordinarily will prove it. We answer, that which is lawfull for him to do once or twice, is not made unlawfull to do oftentimes when the same call and occasion requires it; he may not once do that which is unlawfull, he may not once do that Act of an Elder out of his own place which should needlessely disable him from his work in his own place, but supposing him faithfull in that, he may and ought to put forth any act of an Elder for the good of other Churches, yea for all the Churches in the world (if he be able and thereunto called) as well as to pray and write books for the benefit of all. If he be able without prejudice to his own work at home, he may keep a weekly Lecture in another Congregation for the benefit thereof:

joyned.

Or in administration of Sacraments, suppose a Minister, who hath but a small Congregation, it may be a hundred souls, should live by another Minister who had a Congregation of two or three thousand souls, he may ordinarily assist that other Minister in the administration of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper when it may be done without prejudice to his own little flock. If any should say, it is not lawfull for a Minister to administer the Sacrament in another Congregation, because it is a Church Ast, but yet may receive the people of another Congregation to receive the Sacrament with his Church, as the practice of some is.

We answer, if by a Church Act be meant, that they who receive together must be one Church, that is false, and we think our Brethren will not own it; for if so, none may receive the Sacrament in any Church, but those that are members of that Church. And if it be granted, that they still are members of another Church; Then it is granted that an Elder may do an Act of an Elder amongst those to whom he is not a fixed Officer; and furely he may as well do it when he goes to them, as when they come to him for it: A man doth as truly fend money to his neighbour, who comes to fetch it at his house, as when he carries it to his neighbours house, though his courtesie is more in the latter. If it should be yet further said, that though all this should be granted, that Elders may preach and administer Sacraments to others, yet it will not follow that they may exercise Acts of discipline towards others, though they should call them thereunto in such an Association. We answer first, where is that limitation in the Scripture for the one and not for the other? Neither can our Brethren object it, who acknowledge the Elders power of teaching, ruling, and administration of Sacraments to be commensurable. And we further say, that of all the Acts of an Elder (wherein he is to apply the will of God to others) none are so safe for him to performe as those belonging to discipline, both because they are to be performed in Collegio, with the advice and affiftance of others, and are all to be performed secundum allegata & probata only. We say therefore cleerely, that when many Congregations do mutually agree, that the Elders of their feverall Congregations should joyn by mutuall advise, counsell, and authoritie of Elders to manage all matters of common concernment, difficultie, &c. among themselves: All these thus joyned in a body or an Eldership to those Congregations, and each one doth the Acts of Elders in the Presbytery to those Congregations in all those things for which they are thus associated; yet every one of them severally, and particularly, is not to be looked upon as an Elder of every one of those Congregations, and bound to do the whole work of an Elder to every one of them. And thus it is likewise in human affaires, in the Jewish Common-wealth, the heads of the severall Tribes, when all

joyned together, were as a Parliament to all Israel, and might in that affociated body do many things which could not be required of particular Elders, or heads of the Tribes: So is it with us, the Knights and Burgesses assembled in Parliament may in that Body do many things, in relation to the whole Kingdome, which none of them may do feverally and fingly: So may Colonels affociated in a Councell of War, fo may particular heads of Colledges joyn'd in the Confiltory, so may the Aldermen of severall Wards, when joyned in the Court of Aldermen. And whereas they reply to this, page 8. that in all thefe Instances, these have their distinct names, Laws, and work set out by their several states: For example, The Scripture held out in that of the Tribes, that there were generall heads of the Tribes who were called Elders of the people, the others were called Elders of such and such Cities, of such and such Families, and so forth, and had their severall mork set out by Law; the generall heads hadreserved cases of blasphemy, & c. the like, they say, is in the other instances found among our selves, Colonels, Masters of Colledges, Aldermen of Cities, Burgesses of Towns, and Parliament, have both their Titles, and works set down respectively, what they may do in their lesser Sphear, and what they may do in their greater Associations. But for ours the Scripture holds forth no such thing, they are called Elders similarly and univocally, and we shall reade but simply and singly, Elders and Churches, as relatives, without any such note of distinction.

We Answer, (not to dispute how hard it would be for our Brethren to prove clearly that distinction of the several names and work of these Elders in Israel, &c.) we inquire not after names, but things: And as for the thing in question, we have already cleered, that the Scripture holds out, that as the Church is one, and all the Elders given for the good of that one Church; so their Officers (when orderly called for) should be exercised in any part of it for the good thereof: and that a mutuall confent and agreement, is a fufficient warrant and call for the exercise of this power, whether in one Congregation only, as suppose in Cenchrea, or in many, as suppose in ferusalem, or yet more, as suppose when Antioch and ferusalem joyned, AEt. Chap. 15. that in any of these, or all of these, they may, and ought, upon such a call, exercise any of their gifts and offices, as the Church, or any part thereof shall stand in need: As in a County or Kingdom, when the State fets many Commissioners for preserving the Peace of that County or Kingdom in all their meetings, whether in Parishes, in relation to the Parish only; or in Hundreds, in relation to the Hundred only; or in their Quarter or Generall Sessions: While in all these meetings, they regularly seek to preserve the Common Peace, they are warranted to all by their Commission; so is it here.

As for the allusion of Burgesses in severall Corporations, and their arrogating greater power, or power of larger extent then the Laws allow, under pretence of their names of Burgesses and Corporations, because in some other State or Kingdom, there were Burgesses who had such power as those would claim: which allusion they largely prosecute.

We Answer, It would fully confute us, if we challenged any other power, or extent of power then Christ hath given to all his Ministers

to exercise in any part of his Church upon a call.

We say again, That this power of Ministers is no where any other then Ministeriall, and that is not to be exercised any where at their own wills, but according to his direction, and the call of his Church, and

then they may do it.

But we also answer secondly, That it would suit the Question in hand far better, to suppose that all and every the Parishes in London, yea, in all England, were every one of them such an absolute Corporation, and the severall Inhabitants such Burgesses, that they had not only all power in themselves to do their own businesse, without any others claiming any Authority over them, how bad soever they should grow; but that also it should be pretended to be against their fundamentall Liberties to affociate with any others for matters of difficulty, miscarriages, or common concernment to do any thing for suppressing any enormities among themselves or others, otherwise then by taking or giving counsell and advice, which if they refuse to follow, they may deny familiarity to them, but use no other Authority to reclaim them. Such a Comparison would truly set forth the state of the Controversie; by which we might conjecture what rents, divisions, mischiefs, confusions, all Cities, Townes, and Parishes would quickly be filled and overrun withall.

Thus Your Honours see with what cleer evidence, and upon what just grounds and reason we deny the consequence of their major Proposition, which is the only foundation upon which all the rest is built.

We now proceed to examine the proofes of their Major; First, say they, they must have relation of Elders to all and every one of the members:

For Church and Elders are Relatives.

We Answer first, If by Church there, be meant a particular Church, we deny the truth of that Proposition, Relata do se mutuo ponere & tollere. And a Minister of the Gospel, is so made a Minister to the Catholike Church of Christ, that he doth not cease to be an Elder alwayes when his relation to a particular Church doth cease.

Secondly, When they stand in relation to a particular Church; yet if the meaning be, that they are Relatives, so that every Act of an Elder must Argue him to stand in relation to an Elder in all duties of an El-

C c des

der to that Church or people to who he performs one Act; We have alreadyshewed the falsity of it. An Elder in his work is not limitted by the Law of God to one Congregation, as the office of a Parent or Husband, are limited by the law of nature to their own children or wife, to whom they must perform the duties of these relations wholy & only:or as a Constable is limited by our Laws to one Parish. But rather, as in the former Comparison of Commissioners for the peace, who though they ordinarily exercise their Anthority in some one certain Division, where their residence is, yet occasionally extend it to all parts of the County, as a call requires them; So we say the Elders receive their power and Commission for the whole Church of Christ, and may exercise it where. ever they have a call, and no where without a call; and the mutuall affent and agreement of the persons among whom, and to whom they should exercise it, is the proximum fundamentum hujus exercitii. And whereas they further fay; That the Argument of the Presbyterial Government, is taken by the Presbyterial Divines from this, that many Congregations in Scripture are made one Church, and the Elders thereof Elders of that Church.

We Answer, when a multitude of believers, (though many thousands) agreed together in one presbyterial Government, who had but one only Presbytery, and who probably did all in common, for feeding and governing; they were usually called by the name of one Church, and the Elders were the Elders of that Church: and so it may be still in the like condition. They found it best, in those times of persecution, and publike unsetledness, to have one common Treasury for all their poor, and one common Consistory for all matters of censure: But doubtless had the number of believers grown to such a multitude, as that it would have bred confusion to have all their Ecclesiastical Affairs managed in one Court, and took them off from the rest of their work; the light of nature teacheth us to conclude, that they would have had more Consistories then one for Government, as well as upon the former increase of believers, they grew to have more meeting places then one for Word and Sacraments, and yet would have held such a correspondency as matters of difficulty and Common concernment should have been managed by Common consent. But whether all those Congregations growing so numerous, and those Presbyteries thus divided should have been called one Church still; we know not, nor is it of any moment. We say again, VVe are not inquiring for names and things.

Secondly, their other proof is from the practice of the Elders, who do thus joyn in a Presbyterial Government; because when Congregations in Shires are divided into several Presbyteries, the Elders (though Neighbors) of a bordering Presbyterie, intermedle not with the Congregations under New York

another Presbyterie.

We Answer, It is true, they do take themselves bound in a speciall relation to those Congregations who are associated in that Presbyterie, in those things for which they are Associated, and their mutuall consent and agreement gives them that relation and calling to those things: And the case is here as it is in particular Congregations, all Beleevers are tied to joyn to some Congregation or other, to whom they bear a speciall relation, besides that which they owe to the whole universall Church, yet peradventure their habitation is neerer to some who are of another Congregation, then to some of their own.

And we adde yet further, that these severall Classical Presbyteries may have the like Association and correspondencies amongst themselves as matters of difficulty and common concernment may occasion

and require.

Their Major, and the proofes of it being thus found insufficient, We need not insist longer upon the pretended incongruities, and disproportions, which they have so largely prosecuted in their minor, and the proofes of it: yet so far as there is any thing in them of any seeming weight, we shall take them into consideration, wherein we shall discover some things to be false in themselves, other things not to be prejudiciall to our Assertion. As first, For extending the power of ordinary ruling,

beyond the power of ordinary Preaching.

We Answer, This extends not his ordinary power of the one, beyond the ordinary power of the other, but only the ordinary exercise of the one, beyond the ordinary exercise of the other, having herein a call to the one, and not to the other; which is no incongruity or absurdity (as we have before shewed;) And as for their alledged Scriptures, Asts 20. 28. 2 Pet. 5. Coloss. 1.17. Heb. 13.17. 1 Thess. 5.12. 1 Tim. 3.17. None of them prove the contrary, they only shew that all these things belong to their Office, and that this is the ordinary and usuall practise and work of Elders where their work lies, but none of them prove it unlawfull for an Elder upon a call to do one of these, where they have not occasion, and a call to do the rest.

And as for the comparison, that this was made the usuall Argument against Bishops, that people were forced to obey him, who preached not to them, nor watched over their souls, &c. This Argument, say they, holds

as Well against the Presbyteriall way.

We answer, That the exceptions against Episcopall way, were, that they challenged these things as belonging to them, as men of a higher order, Challenge that to one which belongs to a Colledge, Spoiled both Pastors and people of their power and liberties, Associated not Congregations with them, but Subdued them unto them; Were not mutually subject to the Presbyterie, whom they would have subject to him; Things were not carried in a way of consederation as inter pares;

Cc 2 They

They and their power being wholly extrinsicall to them, businesse not being of mutuall concernment. These and the like were the exceptions against the Episcopall way: but not that it was unlawfull for him being a Presbyter to exercise an Act of Government, upon association toward them to whom he ordinarily preached not: And this is apparent, because even the Nonconformists who pleaded thus against him, yet judged ordination received by imposition of their hands to be valid quoad substantiam actus, because they were Presbyters.

To the Reasons, first, because the ruling power flowes from their power of preaching, and therefore must be extendable no further: as the power of

a Futher is extendable only to his Children.

We answer, First, it is false, that his ruling power flowes from his preaching power, some have the gifts & power of ruling who have not of preaching. Secondly, Were it granted, yet it follows not, that he must do the one where ever he doth the other; both are given him together, but neither to be exercised without a call, and sometimes he may be called to exercise the one and not the other, as we have before shewed.

To the reason of their Reasons, First, say they, if it slow not from his power of Preaching, it must flow from something else: We Answer, all his office and authority is conferred together by Christ his gift, as the

Fountain, and the Churches call, as the meanes.

To their second, All the keyes are given together, &c.

Answer, We grant it, (and this confutes their former Reason, that the power of ruling flowes from their power of Preaching:) And we grant also that the one is extendable as far as the other, even to the whole Church of Christ, but ever as he shall be called, and as the good of the Church requires, yet the exercise of the one is not necessary to be extended actually as far as the exercise of the other.

To their third, the instance of the Apostles, that their power was ex-

tendable with their commission to Preach, &c.

Answ. Very true, so was their power to administer the Sacraments, yet Paul took not himself bound to exercise his power of baptizing in all places, where he took himself bound to Preach, but attended chiefely to that which might most benefit the Church. And our Brethren seeme to us not a little to weaken their own Argument, and strengthen our Answer, in their alledging in the same place, that though the Apostles (as Apostles) power of ruling was extendable with their Preaching; Yet grant that they might exercise the one, where they might not exercise the other. For if an Apostle, as an Apostle, may exercise one Act of his Ministery, where he may not exercise another, then may a Presbyter, as a Presbyter exercise one Act of his Ministery, where he may not exercise another.

To their second head of incongruities, that it makes a disproportion between the workes or offices of Ruling and Preaching Officers compared be-

tween

tween themselves, because a Pastor, qua pastor, is limited in the highest

work of Preaching to one Congregation, and not in his ruling.

We Answer, The Pastors are given to the whole Church, and are not limited in their highest Office of Preaching to one Congregation: his ordinary exercise of Preaching may possibly be limited to one Congregation, yet not necessarily, for he may keep an ordinary Lecture in another. Nor doth it (as their next head of incongruities imports) make him a Ruling Elder to some, and a Preaching Elder to others: These two make him not two Officers, but are two branches of his one Office, either of which he is to exercise as a call requires; And it is no incongruity or absurdity to say that he may have a Relation to one Congregation to do some Acts of his Office upon a call, and yet not tied to all.

To the next head concerning the extent of the Deacons Office, the fum whereof is; That then the Deacons Office might be extended to more Congregations then one. We Answer, so it was in ferusalem, and fo it may be still, as the like condition of the Church may require: were the poor Saints to be maintained now as then, only by voluntary Contributions, divers Congregations might be affociated in this work also, for the common care of their poor: And with us (where God in mercy hath otherwise provided for the poor) the Law hath ordered, that if one Parish be not able to maintain their own poor, the Neighbour' Parishes are to joyn with them in it; So, that neither by Gods Law, nor mans Law, doth this carry any incongruity with it. Yet neither from hence doth it follow that therefore it must be so, that the Deacons Office must extend in the exercise of it, as far, and no farther then the Preachers: The Deacons Office in the Churches of Asia, was extended to fend reliefe to the Churches of Ierusalem, in a time of Famine; when vet they fent not their Preachers to preach to them of ferusalem, because there was no Famine of the Word; And the Churches at Antioch fent fome of their Elders to Preach, where they fent none of their Deacons to distribute almes: All these things are to be managed and exercised as the common good of the Church doth require.

To their next head of Incongruities from the mutuall duties which necessarily follow upon this standing relation, First, That the people must honour and esteem, yea, yeeld maintenance to those who thus ordinarily rule them, which they prove by tim.5.17, 18. and if that the Elders of a particular Flocke, are to have their maintenance for their preaching there, and performing the lesser Alts of ruling there, much more should they be maintained for performing the greater Alts in the Classis: What reason (say they) is there that particular Congregations should maintain their own Elders for performing one part of the Elders work, and that they should yet be bound to maintain the rest for all the other part of the worke:

and yet due it is from every person as he is able; how burthensome and con-

fused a thing would this be?

To all which we Answer, that it is most true, that Elders are to be honoured and maintained for their works fake, even because they are wholly fet apart to this work: and where they do the whole work of an Elder to a particular Congregation, it is requisite that they should receive a sufficient maintenance; but yet it follows not that all must necessarily contribute to their maintenance who receive any fruit of their Ministery. Suppose the State, or some able and well-affected person in a place should fet apart a plentifull and honorable maintenance to a Minister, for the service of his Ministery in such a Congregation, so that he might live plentifully upon it, without the peoples contributing any thing to him, are the people notwithstanding bound to contribute another honorable maintenance to him, because of his work among them? or if a combination of Ministers should associate freely to bestow a weekly Lecture in some great town or City: yea, suppose they should do it every day of the weeke; Are the people to whom they are willing freely to Preach, bound to maintain all those?

Again it is a mistake that our Brethren say, that Ministers united in Classical Presbyteries have maintenance for performing one part of their Office. We say, they performe all which belongs to their Office, which concernes their Congregation only, if they be able; their joyning in the Classes is for matters of common concernment, and to help them, wherein they are insufficient to do their own work belonging to their

own Congregations.

To their second, wherein they say, that those who are thus associated, must then be bound to all other Offices of Elders, as to visite the sick, to visit the people from house to house, to watch over them all, to preach to them in sea-

Son and out of Sealon.

We answer as before, they are bound only by their Association to the duties for which they associate. And as for the Gravamen of theirs to make the Presbyterian way to appear worse then that of the Bishops.

We answer, we are sorry our Brethren delight so much in this comparison; the Bishops arrogated to themselves to be the only Pastors of the Diocesse, rob'd the Pastors of their authority, spoiled the people of their Liberty, made all their servants and vassalls. The Presbyterian way is not a that of Masters over Servants, but sociall, as between equals, between brethren, friends, colleagues, confederates, &c. where all judge, and all are judged, where no Congregation is above another Congregation, no Minister above another Minister, where every Elder is left to injoy the whole office of an Elder, and each Congregation left to the freedome of a Congregation in what belongs to them, and they able to perform it; and the Classes, to corroborate strengthen and help them We are not willing to say more of this odious comparison.

To their objection which they suppose may be made, that they may part the work between them, of which they indeavour a large confutation.

We answer, we never made this absurd objection, we say not that men may part that work among many, and leave but one part of it to one, when God would have one do all; we say every Elder must indeavour to do all his own work, and be assistant to his Brethren in helping forward their work: But what strength soever there be in their objection, sure we are, the instances brought by our Brethren to consute it, are very improper to give a satisfactory solution. When the Elders among the Hebrewes are said to watch over the souls of the people, and the same Elders are charged by Peter to feed the slock of God among them, the same charge which was given to the Elders of Ephesus, Alts 20, and this shock contained all the strangers scattered throughout Fontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia; sure these Elders were compeled to part the work among them.

And further, whereas they demand, Where bath the Scripture parted that work, so that he who is fixed in one Congregation to do all the work of an Elder, should part with others in some of their work, & leave part of his to them?

We answer, we affirm no such thing, but on the other side we desire our Brethren to shew where the Scripture hath made such a fixing of an Elder to one Congregation, as that it should be unlawfull for him to do any Act of an Elder to any part of the rest of the Church of Christ, to whom he is yet given by Christ as an Elder. For our part we conceive that both the division of the Church into Congregations, and of fixing particular Elders to them, is no further of divine Institution then order and edification did first occasion, and do still require it should be so; we conceive, it is here as it was in the Church of the Jewes, to whom the whole Tribe of Levi were given as their Ministers. When all the Israelites lived together in one body (though many hundred thousands) as when they were in the Weldernesse, the whole Tribe of Levi were but as one body or Colledge of Elders to them all, and for ought we know fed them all in common, and afterwards when the Tribes came to be fixed in their feverall divisions, the wife providence and grace of God ordered it so, that the Levites were also scattered, and fixed among them.

To their last head of incongruities, that this is inconsistent with the ordinary way of the calling of Elders, both for their choyce and ordination; first, then all the people of these Congregations must choose all these Elders who rule them, as well as those that are to preach to them, as this they largely insist upon, desiring to know under what notion or consideration they are to choose him who is to be their ordinary fixt Elder, and the other, who are only to rule them.

We answer, what ever the peoples right be in choosing their Elders,

this Association is no abridgement of it in any kind: We say clearely, that the severall Congregations singly choose or except of the one to be their Pastor to doe all offices which concern a Pastor or Minister among them: And all the Congregations joyntly in this Association do choose or accept of, or associate with all the rest to be a Presbytery, to transact with themselves all matters of difficulty and common concernment.

And as to that aggravation added to this reason, that if the highest Alts be committed to them, as that of Excommunication (of all punishments the most formidable, a matter of as great, if not more concernment, as life it self) the injoying of all ordinances for ever, together with the deposition of their Ministers, that then there is so much the more reason, that

all the people should have the election of them.

We answer, first, if all who are liable to excommunication, and injoyment of Ordinances, and Ministers, &c. must therefore elect them, then women must elect as well as men: Secondly, the censure of Excommunication, with the formidable confequences of it, are far more dangerous in our Brethrens way, then in this of the Presbyterie, because in this way, if any man be wronged, he may have the benefit of his appeale, and be cleared by more righteous Judges (a course ever followed by the Church, and agreeable to the light of nature) but in their way, if two or three (it may be) ignorant or corrupt Elders, prevailing with the major part of (it may be) a very small Congregation, do once deliver a man to Satan, and will not be induced by counsell to reverse their unrighteous sentence; the innocent wronged man must lie under this doome all the dayes of his life without any remedy, and must be held by all the Churches of Christ (to whom their sentence doth but innotescere) as an excommunicate person, and shun'd accordingly, none having power to absolve him. Thirdly, neither is the sentence of Excommunication fo dreadfull as they make it, (for as the Apostle saith of the Magistrates Sword, Rom. 13. If thou do well, &c.) good men need not feare it, if men deserve it not, either it shall not touch them, or if it do, clavis errans non ligat, and if it be just, it was done in heaven before, and they only on earth declare and apply the will of Christ to him, and that for the destruction of the steff, that his spirit may be saved; and upon his repentance be received again into the bosome of the Church, and therefore Excommunication should be imbraced as a foul-faving Ordinance of Jesus Christ, as well as the Word and the Sacraments. And as to that of Ordination, we shall not need to say much, because our Brethren say little of it; and do in their judgements not look upon it as a matter of any great weight, esteeming the whole essence of the Ministerial calling to be in the peoples choyce, and his ordination at fometimes not at all requisite; and when it is used, it is lookt upon only as a solemne admitting of him into his place.

To their Reasons against, and Exceptions to the first proof of the surft Assertion, viz. That the Church of ferusalem consisted of more Congregations then one, from the multitude of Beleevers.

Against Which

They bring first Reasons to shew there were not more then could meet in one place.

"The Holy Ghost hath from first to last (say they) as on purpose shewed this: as if his scope had been before hand, to prevent and preclude all rea-

" sonings to the contrary.

We incline to believe, that the Holy Ghost intended rather to shew the early accomplishment of that Promise, Ier. 32.39. of Giving one heart and one way, by his so frequent mentioning of buodouad dy and into adut as adjuncts of the first Christian Church meetings: then (as our Brethren suggest) to prevent and preclude all reasonings against this Assertion of theirs, viz. "That the Beleevers in Ierusalem were not more then could meet in one place.

"To the first branch of their Argument brought from the forementioned Reason I.

" adjuncts as they stand upon Record, Acts 1.14,15.

1. We answer, first, that their being δμοθυμαθδι (which properly sig- Answ. 1. nifieth consent of minds) doth not all argue their being in one place; a thousand Congregations may be said upon a Sabbath or Feast day to be δμοθυμαθδι in prayer, and yet may be met in severall and far distant

places.

2. That their being affembled and the down doth not necessarily inforce it, because here the words may, and in some places must admit of another Translation, as Att. 4.26,27, where and down fignishes not a convention of persons in one place, (who can make it appear that ever Herod, Pontius Pilate, the Gentiles, and the people of Israel were so assembled against Christ?) but only a consent of mindes in one thing. Accordingly in Symmachus his Translation of the second Ps. out of which these words are taken, in stead of the Septuagints and such as meet in consultation to carry on the same businesse, may well be said to be gathered together and to doubt though they meet in severall places: as with us, The Lords and Commons assemble themselves and to do are but one Parliament, though met in two Houses.

3. Not denying those AE. I. 15. to have mettogether in one place (though we deny the two adjuncts of Sunday and and to are to prove it) our answer to the Argument is, That it falls short of what our Brethren intend to affert: Because it doth not appear from hence, that

Dd the

the whole Church was there assembled, but the contrary rather. We will not infilt upon the word ovoucaron ( the number not of men, but of names) which according to some is to be restrained to men of chiefe Note and Eminencie, fo Rev. 3.4. and Chap. 11.13. Nor will we urge that possibly these were such, every one whereof was capable of Election to an Apostleship: which was the Tiegyov of this meeting; (for that this was a different meeting from that spoken of v.14. is evident by the transition, And in those dayes, &c. ) But this we say, That however taking in only men of Note and Disciples of longest standing in Christs School (Even those that companied with the Apostles all the time that the Lord fesus went in and out among them, beginning from the Baptisme of Iohn unto the day of our Saviours Ascension: of whom ver. 21, 22.) It is very probable that the number of fuch did not exceed one hundred and twentie: yet that there were then no more Beleevers in ferusalem cannot well be imagined by any that shall duly consider the Preparation made for Christ by Iohns Baptisme and Ministry: the yeares of Christs own Preaching and Miracles: the Commission he gave to the twelve Apostles and seventy Disciples, together with the operation which his Death, Resurrection, and Ascension had upon the Beholders. Who can but think that by all these many more then one hundred and twentie were converted to the Faith? VVhen the Lord Iesus had but begun his Ministry, the Pharisees heard that he made and baptized more Disciples then Iohn. Ioh. 4.1. of whom notwithstanding tis said, Mar. 1.5. There went out unto him all the land of Indea, and they of Ierusalem, and were all baptized of him. The same men afterwards took up this Complaint against Christ, Ioh. 12.19. Behold, the world is gone after him: what ground had there been either for a Report or a Complaint of this nature, if the whole multitude of his Disciples, or of the Converts in Ierusalem had come within the narrow compasse of one hundred and twentie? I Cor. 15. 6. we read of five hundred Bethren before Christs Ascension.

4. Suppose it should be granted that the whole multitude of Beleevers in Ierusalem were here met in one place, it will not from thence follow, that so they might do, and did afterwards when the Church was

multiplied.

2. "But afterwards, Acts 2.1. Another meeting of theirs is expressed

" in the same words, They were all met with one accord, &c.

To which we Answerstill: That it's not proved that they all there mentioned were All the Church. Beza saith, that in two ancient Coppies he findes & And And brings probable Reasons why they All should be meant of the Apostles only: As first, the coherence with the very last words of the fore-going Chapter mentioning the Eleven Appostles. Secondly, their being filled with the Holy Ghost, and speaking with tongues, ver. 4. Which was promised to the Appostles, and

Reas.2.
Answ.

Diffenting Brethren, against the Instance of the Church of Jerusalem.

and they commanded to wait at ferufalem for it, Atts 1.2,4,8. Thirdly, the multitudes calling them Galileans, ver. 7. Fourthly, the not mentioning of any other in the whole Chapter but the Apostles only, ver. 14. Peter stands up with the Eleven, v.37. They said unto Peter and the rest of the Apostles, ver. 42. in the Apostles fellowship, ver. 43. signes were done by the Apostles, from all which it is likely that this meeting was of the Apostles only, and if so, it's then nothing to our Brethrens purpose, however if it be a meeting of the whole Church, the Church was not then multiplied to a greater number then in the first Chapter.

"But when they were about three thousand, yet still some of their meet- Real. 3. "ings for some Acts of Worship are recorded to have been as before " ouodunador, and in stead of the other expression on to dot, The place it " self where they were is set down, to supply and interpret it, and to shew, it " was still in one Assembly, as ver. 46. They continued our Dunasor in the "Temple, where they most frequently met, not for Iewish Worship, but " for hearing the Word, at which though the Iewes were present, yet it hin.

" dered not, but that to them it was a Church-meeting, &c.

By all which, this only our Brethren undertake to prove, that some Answ, of their meetings for some Acts of VV or ship were in one place, wherein they seeme to yeeld the cause: for if they could not meet together for all Acts of VVorship, and especially for those which are peculiar to Church-Communion, our Assertion is not at all infringed. They met indeed in the Temple to hear the Word, which (though no Iewish worship) yet was common to Iewes and Christians, as themselves confesse: But can they prove that in the Temple they administred the Sacraments, which are the distinguishing Ordinances of the Christian Church? Interpreters of all forts from the very next words collect the Brentius. contrary, viz. that the Lords Supper was administred in more private Aretius. Congregations, they continued daily with one accord in the Temple, but it was from House to House that they brake bread, which was Sacra- Beza. mentall breaking of bread, as that phrase is understood generally by all, Alts 20.7. and by our Brethren themselves in the 42. ver. of this second Chapter, where the Syruck hath the very word Eucharistia, which is expressely said, ver.46. to be wer' of zov in oposition to en Tuis ga, and for Beza. the phrase 227' oixor, we find it used for an house appointed for Church meeting, Rom. 16.5. and 1 Cor. 16.19. however it is not rationally sup- Rom 16. posable that the whole multitude of Beleevers met in the Temple to receive the Lords Supper: for first the Sacrament was no Temple Ordinance, and therefore not to be administred in the Temple: nor secondly could it have been done with safety: for if the Apostles were so quarrel'd for preaching Jesus and the Resurrection in the Temple, Act. 4.2. (though never challenged for administring the Sacrament in it) and Paul so assaulted for being supposed to bring a Greek into the Dd 2

Temples

Temple, what would it have been to have brought in a new Ordinance, and a new worship into the Temple? Our Brethren themselves are senfible of this, and therefore although in the Assembly some of them disputed for their receiving the Sacrament in the Temple, yet now they wave it, and content themselves to say, they met there some times for some Acts of worship.

Real. 4. "Fourthly, say they, when there was a further adddition, Act. 5.1. (in which "Chapter is a paralell description to that, Chap. 2. 43. ad finem) speaking of another meeting, the same words are used, ver. 41. That they were " διιοθυικιβον, as Acts 2. And in stead of the Temple there, is Salomons "Porch here: Which was a place large enough to hold them, called the "Temple, Ioh. 10.23. the outward Court by Yosephus lib. 20. cap. 8. "mhere Christ used to walk and preach, and the Apostles also, Act. 3. II. " And that the Apostles only did not meet here, first, is apparent from the "paralell place, A&s 2. Secondly, its unlikely the Apostles should meet and " not the People, who are said to continue in the Apostles doctrin and fel-Answ.I. lowship.

Pineda de

rebus Salo-

monis,'.3.

6.5.1.5.C.

19. Maldonat.

23.

4.

5.

That this was another meeting cannot be denied, but that it was a meeting of All the Church or for All Acts of worship is not proved, nor can be, which if not proved, this makes nothing against our Proposition.

Secondly, If this place be so paralell to that of Act. 2.43. &c. the same answer will serve here, which was made there, to which we refer them.

Thirdly, What Salomons Porch in our Saviours time was, and why fo called, is thought by some too difficult a question to be resolved.

Fourthly, In that place of Iosephus we find no mention of the outward Court, but he is conceived by Pineda to be contrary to himself in the description of the Temple, and the same Author conceiveth it was

in Ioin. 10. most unlikely to be Atrium Populi.

Fifthly, That they all that met here were all the Church, will not be proved from the pretended paralell of Atts 2. and that the Apostles should meet with one accord without the Church is not so unlikely as is imagined, why might not the Twelve go to the Temple without the Church as well as Peter and Iohn did? Acts 3.1. specially it not being faid that they were preaching there, but working miracles; nor can the All here spoken of be referred to the Church in the 11.ver.more then to the many which heard, who were not of the Church exprest in the fame verse, but rather appeares to be meant of the Apostles only, they being mentioned in this 12. verse.

Reaf. 5. "Fifthly, Further when they chose Deacons, Acts 6. which was cer-"tainly a Church meeting, they were yet no more then could meet in one "place; for the Aposles called the multitude, and ver. 5. they are called the "whole multitude, and ver.6, they as in one place chose seven men, and " set them before the Apostles, who prayed, in which duty the whole mul-"titude had an Interest to joyn, &c.

1. That this was a meeting for Church businesse, we deny not. 2. But Answ. 1, we do deny that the mentioning of the multitude and the whole multitude proves that all and every one of them that beleeved in ferusalem were at that meeting, for it may fignifie either a great multitude, as Luke 8. 37. the whole multitude of the Gadarens befought Christ to depart from them, and Alts 25.24. Festus saith, All the multitude had dealt with him about Paul: not every individual Gadaren or Iem, but a great number of them, or the generalitie, which the Greeks use to expresse by mayon nust, or it may signifie as Luk 1.10. where it its said the whole multitude of the people were Without, praying, that is, prasentium, of them that were present, and not of all that were in Ierusalem: so here the faying pleased the whole multitude, implies not that the whole multitude of all the Beleevers were present, but that so many as were prefent the faying pleafed, and our Brethren themselves grant that by multitude sometimes is understood not All but select persons, as Acts. 15.12. Then all the multitude kept silence, which even themselves will not ex. pound of All the Church, but only of such as were men of age & discretion, excluding women & children, who if excluded from the multitude there, why not here? especially considering that this meeting was for the chooling of Church Officers: wherein we suppose our Brethren will not allow women and children their suffrages. And indeed if we consider the five thousand, chap. 4.4 and besides the great additions and multiplications, chap.5.14. Beleevers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women, and chap 6.1. again it's faid the number of Disciples was multiplied, we cannot in reason conceive that they all could meet in one place to be one Assembly, but must be distributed into severall divisions, as the 400000 men of Israel were, Indo. 20. else how could the Levite have told his sad Story to them all together and at once: the like we may conceive of that Congregation, Nehem. 9.5 where eight Levites spake to them all, which unlesse it had been done to them divided into feverall companies, would have confounded both the people and themselves..

"And whereas Our Brethren urge their choosing of Officers, and pre"fenting them before the Apostles, to prove their being assembled in one
"place. Let them but consider how the City of London choose their
Common-Councell, and present them to the Court of Aldermen. So
that our answer to their fift reason is this, its not proved, nay, it's not
probable that all the Beleevers there met. 2. Not in one Company. 3. Or were both proved, yet we say, more may meet for

choise of Officers then can meet to receive the Sacrament.

"After all this, Acts 15. they are said to meet our dupator, and naming Reas. 6. 2 the place, where still it imports one assembly, and after Acts 21.22. The multitude must needs come together, &c.

D 3

Wo.

Except. I.

Answ. 1. We answer, it's to be proved that that ino superstream relates to the whole body of the Church. We say to the Synod of the Apostles and Elders, as we shall shew hereafter. And secondly, in subupative alone will never prove their meeting in one place, though we deny not, but here they were met in one. For that other Text Act 21. The multitude must needs come together, &c. how doth that prove there were at that time no more in the Church of ferusalem, then might meet in one place? we may say of London, the multitude will come together upon such and such an occasion, doth this import no more in London then may meet in one place? besides the meeting there spoken of was like to be rather a concourse of a missinformed multitude, then of a Congregation for worship; but however, we are glad our Brethren understand this multitude to be of the Church of ferusalem, we are afraid they will forget it anon.

And for Conclusion, we humbly desire it may be observed, that all our Brethren have endeavoured to prove, is, that the Beleevers in Jerusalem were no more then could meet together in one place at some times, for some acts; as for choosing of Officers, So their first instance, and their fifth; for making of Decrees, So the sixth; (out of both which Assemblies, women and children, a better half of the Company, are excluded) for hearing, So the second and third; but not a word brought to prove that they all met in one place to receive the Sacrament, as to that, they were severall Congregations. So that should we grant all these their instances, what would follow, but this? That the Beleevers at Ierusalem who received the Sacrament in severall places and Assemblies, and so were severall Congregations, did yet sneet in one place, and one Assembly to choose Officers, Asts 1.6. and to performe other Acts of Government, Ast. 15. and therefore it is evident that although they were severall Con-

gregations, yet they were under on Presbyteriall Government.

"We come now to their exceptions against our proofes: The sirst whereof is to the instance of sive thousand, Acts 4. against which they object, first, that it cannot be evinced, that these five thousand were a new number added to the three thousand, c.2. Beza and Calvin think those three thoufand are included here. Secondly, nay it is not certain that the five thoufand here were Beleevers: the Greek will as well carry it to expresse the
number of hearers. Thirdly, and far when put alone (as here) includes
females as well as males. Fourthly, if to be understood of present Converts
and of mules only, it would be a greater miracle then ever was be-

August. in "fore or since, &c.

tract. 31. We reply to the first, though Calvin and Eeza think the three thouin Ioan. Ac- sand formerly converted to be included here, yet divers both Ancient
collections

corpori Domini, i.e. numero filelium tria millia hominum, item alio fasto quodam mirocu'o accessivatia quinque millia. So is the Text understood by Hierome, Chrysestome, Occumenius, Lyra, Lorinus, Salmoron; and of ours by Arctius and Pelargus, Bullinger makes it doubtfull.

and

and Moderne Interpreters are of another mind. And we have not only testimony but reason to induce us to be of the same opinion; not to insust upon that which some observe, that as the three thousand Ass 2.

41. did not comprehend the one hundred and twenty mentioned Ass 1. So it holds proportion that the three thousand mentioned there, are not comprehended here, but this we affirme that the latter part of this 4 ver. of Ass 4. is exegeticall of the former, now the former part must needs be meant of those that were won to the Faith at that Sermon, and therefore the latter part must be understood of them also; besides, this Sermon was not exintentione to the Church, but upon occasion of the multitude slocking together to behold the Miracle, to whom Peter and John preached in the Temple, whilst the Church, or a great part of it, might, it is likely, be attending in private upon the Ministry of the other Apostles, of whom no mention is made in this passage but of Peter and John only.

To the second we say, that the true Syntax of the Greeke carries the number to Beleevers, and not to Hearers; TONNO! Is, many of them that heard the Word Beleeved; and if you aske how many, the Holy Ghost tels ye the number of those many Beleevers was about five thousand. Secondly, the Spirit of God doth not use to compute the number of bare hearers. Thirdly, we know no Interpreters that so expound the

place.

"As for the reason they seeme to alleadge, why it should be meant of the "number of hearers, viz. because that such a multitude should heare the "Apostles was the thing that fretted the Pharisees. VVe answer. I. That the aggrieved persons mentioned v. I. and 2. were the Sadduces and not the Pharisees. Secondly, 'Twas not so much the multitude of Hearers, as the Doctrin taught that so vexed them, as is exprest ver. 2. Because they preached through fesus the Resurrection which the Sadduces denied; and thirdly, should we grant that the Multitude was the thing that fretted them, certainly it would vex them more that five thousand beleeved that Doctrin, then that five thousand heard it.

To the third, though we contend not much that by ar I fairly here, Males only should be meant, yet it may seeme probable, if first we consider that the Custome of the Iewes was to number only the Males. Secondly, if we compare Ioh. 6.10. with Mat. 14.21. A red gis, set alone in Iohn it is expounded to be besides women and children in Matth. But thirdly, take women & children and all in, yet adde those other new Multitudes mentioned, Ast. 5.14. Ast. 6.1. Ast. 6.7. & we yet affirm they were more then could meet together in one place to receive the Sacrament.

To the fourth, viz. that this (if thus understood) would be a greater miracle then any before or since. VVe answer. 1. That the like may be

faid of the three thousand converted, chap. 2. that it was such a thing as was never before nor since, if (as they think) there were not 5000 converted here, shall we question the truth of that therefore? Secondly, it was the day of Christs power, in which his willing people from the wombe of that morning ('twas foretold) should be multiplied as the

Dew upon the earth, Plal. 110.3.

Eccep. 2. "The second Exception is, That it may be supposed that those that were "converted at Jerusalem remained not constant members of that Church.

"For first the 3000 chap. 2, were not dwellers at Jerusalem, but strangers out of all those countries mentioned in that chapter who came up to Pentecost. Secondly, and therefore were (as some interptet it) Sojourners at

"Jerusalem, not divellers, as Eliah in I Kings 17. 20. sojourned with the "midow of Sareptha, M:3" his how used, saith the Septuagint, the very word here used. Thirdly, they are said to be dwellers of Mesopotamia,

"Cappadocia, &c. ver.9. and devellers of Jerusalem and those Countries "too, they could not be. And fourthly, that Which strengthens this, is that, "ver.5. They are said to be Καβακένθες εν Ιεγεσαλημ.but ver.9. Καβοικένθες την

"Mesocrotupiar. Therefore fifthly, the 14. ver. calls them men Iewes and dwellers at Jerusalem, as two forts, and ver. 22 men of Israel, the stile given the ten Tribes, and ver. 5. devout men who used to come up at those

" solemne Feasts, and after a time to return to their families again.

To all which our reply is this: first we find it not elsewhere said in Scripture, that those who came up to the Feasts at ferusalem were Kattings so legastand, and though Kaluna, sometime possibly may be put for παροιπώ, and so may signifie to sojourn, yet by our Brethrens own confession, it may signifie to dwell. Eliahs sojourning with the widdow was 200 a yeare, so in the margent the word is rendred, and so Indges 17. 10. and Indges 11. the last vers. and 1 Sam. 7.16. and let our Brethren grant these but so long abode at ferusalem, it might be long enough to make them members of that Church. And why it should signifie to sojourne at Ierusalem, ver. 5. and to dwell in Mesopotamia, ver. 9. we see not: for their Criticisme of, or I gestandiu will not prove it, seeing that Att. 16.4. themselves will needs understand by, των σρεσων των εν Ιερεσωννήμ, not the Elders that were present at Ierusalem, but the Elders fixed in, and Officers of the Church of Ierusalem.

To that of Alls 2. 14. (Men Iewes and dwellers at Ierusalem) We answer, the words need not imply two forts, at least in our Brethrens sence, namely of some Iewes living in the Country, and others dwelling at Ierusalem, but all may be of ferusalem notwithstanding that expression, thus; Men Iewes may be understood of those of the Iewish nation; All ye that dwell at Ierusalem of the Proselytes, who being

Answ.

2.

converted to the Iewish Religion, had for Religions sake there taken up their dwelling: so for that of the 22.v. Men of Israel; the stile, say they, given to the ten Tribes, We answer, that phrase is not proper to the ten Tribes, but applied to the Iewes, nay to the dwellers of Ierusalem, as AELS 3.12 and AELS. & 35. where Gamaliel speaking to the Councell of Ierusalem, saith, Yea Men of Israel. And for the appellation of devout Men, ver. 5. that makes nothing against us, but what is there added, viz. that these devout men were dwelling at Ierusalem is much for us.

2 But granting secondly, That many of those of whom this chap. speaks had been formerly dwellers in Mesopotamia and Cappadocia, &c. what hinders but that they might now be dwellers at Ierusalem? The occasion of their comming up thither at this time, being not only the Feast of Pentecost (which was a Feast but of one day) but also the great expectation, that the people of the Iewes then had, of the appearance of the Messiah in his Kingdom (as we may collect from Luke 19. 11. where it's said, They thought the Kingdom of God should immediately appear) so that now they might choose to take up their dwellings at Ierusalem, and not return as they had been wont at the end of their usual Feasts.

But nature taught them (saith our Brethren) to provide for their Obje. 12. wives and children, and not desert them.

And how know we but they might bring up their wives and children Answ. with them, which some did in those ordinary Feasts, and therefore might be more likely upon this extraordinary occasion? 2. Or why might they not fetch up their families to them? which is more probable then that they would leave the Apostles fellowship to go back to their families, especially considering that their hearts were inflamed with such an abundant love to the Gospel, and Church of Christ, as that they sold their possessions, and parted them to all men, as every man had need, chap. 2. ver. 45. and chap. 4.34,35. thereby outing themselves of their former possessions, and providing for their own Subsistence at Ierusalem, and the support of others that had need, who upon the same ground continued there with them: nor is it very probable that men thus spirited, should mind returning to their own possessions, in case they had not sold all. Thirdly, but however we have light enough from Scripture to prove (and that according to our Brethrens principles and affertions ) that they were all members of the Church of lerusalem. Thus. They which are added to the Church, continue in Church Communion, put their estates into the Churches common Treasury, choose Officers for the Church, are Members of the same Church: but these multitude of Beleevers were added to the Church, Alts 2. last, &c. Therefore all that whole multitude

Ee

were

Object.

Answ:

were members of that Church; yea our Brethren themselves take that fellowship of theirs, AEts 2.42. for a patterne of ordinary Church Communion. And should we grant this Church to be ebbing and flowing, as our Brethren speak, in point of residence of Members, yet those Members that were non resident, were for all that members of that Church: Are not some members of our Brethrens Congregations so? yea have they not their dwellings sometimes at greater distance from the usuall place of their Church-meeting, then the utmost borders Judea were from Hierusalem, and members still? and yet according to our Brethrens affection, the number of members, whether resident or not, must not be more then that they might (did they all reside) meete together in one place.

"But some of these were of Judea, the Countrey about, and that of these "might be Churches erected in their proper dwellings is rationally suppose- able: for Acts 8.1. it is said, Paul persecuted Disciples in other places besides Hierusalem, as Acts 26. at Damascus, and upon the ceasing of the persecution its said, the Churches had rest throughout all Judea, Act. 931.

Our answer to this, shall be no other then what our Brethren make their fourth exception, viz. That this being the first Church, and whereof all, the Apostles were the Officers, the beleevers who dwelt there (we adde and who dwelt neare) would certainly abide together as one Church, without parting or dividing, till they came to the utmost proportion that the constitution of a Church was capable of, to a maximum quod sic: And therefore it is not so rationably supposeable, that those that lived so neare ferusalem, would so soone erect Churches in their proper dwellings; nor will Pauls persecuting the Saints in other places besides ferusalem, prove Churches in Judea; for the very text cited, Alts 8.1. expresseth, that those of the Church of ferusalem, were scattered abroad throughout all Judea and Samaria, so that still they whom Paul persecuted unto strange Cities, were Members of the Church of Ferusalem; and this Paul himselfe tells us, Acts 26, yet we deny not, but that they who were thus scartered abroad, preaching the word, AELs 8.4. Churches were erected in Indea, Galile and Samaria, of whom it is said, Acts 9.31. that the persecution ceasing, they were edified and multiplied.

"Their third Exception is, That they in those Conntries had great "Assemblies, consisting of many thousand hearers at once, that could "and did hear; So Christ, Luke 12. 1. preached to Myriads, many thou"Sands: So Acts 13.45. almost the whole city came to heare the Word of God by Paul; at Charenton many thousands heare in one place, as is "well knowne, and so in many places in England; Moses sometimes "spake in the ears of all the people, so Ezza chap. 10.9, 10. and it is

known

Excep.

"known by experience, that in hot Countries, as Men may see further by " reason of the purenesse of the ayre, so they may hear at a greater distance " then in cold.

We answer, first, that we reade Luk. 12. of Myriads, (or as our English translation renders it) an innumerable multitude gathered together, so that they trod one upon another, but not, first that they all heard, nor secondly that Christ preached to them all, the Text is expresse, fesus began to say to his Disciples; and though upon occasion of a question made by one of the company, ver. 13. he speakes something appliable to the people, ver. 14. yet he returnes to preach to his Disciples againe, vers. 22. As for that in the 54 verse, its question whether that be part of the same Sermon. To that Acts 13. 45. The Whole City came together to heare, &c. We answer, That City was Antioch of Pisidia, and how do they prove that to be so populous a City? Or secondly, That all they that came together heard the word, it is said indeed, they came together to heare the word, but many more might come together intentionally to heare, then actually did or could heare, as in many affemblies in this City. Thirdly, the Text makes equal mention of Paul and Barnabas, as both speaking to the people, and why then might they not be in distinct assemblies or divisions?

As to that of Charenton, where they say, It is well knowne many thousands heare: We answer, first, That the number of the Members of that Church doth not (probably) arise to the number of them in Ferusalem, when at highest before the dispersion. Secondly, That their meeting place, (as it is well knowne) hath such accommodation of seats and double Galleries, as they had not either in the Temple or Solomons Porch. Thirdly, Besides that large meeting place thus accommodated, they have (as we are informed) on Sacrament dayes, two other places where they then preach and administer, and yet but one Church. The like answer will serve in part for England; There do not meete so many (that can heare) as were of the Church of ferusatem. Secondly, They have better accommodation then they had: and Thirdly, More may heare at once then can at once receive the Sacrament: and therefore in great Congregations, they are necessitated to receive some at one time, and some at another.

For that of Moses, its true, we reade he spake in the eares of Dout 5.1. the people, but doe our Brethren in good earnest believe, that Moses had such a strong voice as could reach to all Israel at once? who the last time before this that they were numbred, were fixe hundred thousand, one thousand seven hundred and thirty, Numbers 26. 51. besides twenty three thousand Levites, they males only, verse 62. that phrase therefore of speaking

The Answer of the Assembly of Divines, to the Reasons of the

in all their eares, must necessarily be some other wayes understood; as first either in their presence, to them being present, as Deodate renders it, Gen. 20.8. and Gen. 44.18. in loro presenza; Or secondly Mediately, he to some, and they to others, as is propable, Exod. 11.2. where Moses is commanded to speake in the eares of the people, that every man and woman borrow Jewels, &c. who were not (in all likelihood) suffer'd to leave their taskes to meet all together to hear that Proclamation: Or thirdly, Turmatim & successive, they were spoken to inseverall companies, Moses to one, and some others joyned with him to others; as Deut. 32. 44. it is said, And Moses pake in the ears of the people, he and Hoshea the son of Nun: Or fourthly, By all the people, is meant all the heads and Rulers of them, as Deut. 31.30. Moles is said to speak in the ears of all the Congregation; yet verse 28. the Elders of the Tribes only were gathered together for him to speak to: the like answer may be given to that instance of Ezra.

To that experiment, which our Brethren mention of hearing at a farther distance in pure ayre and in hot Countries then in cold, we oppose the judgement of that great Master of Experiments in this kind. the Lord of Verulam, who in his Centuries expresly saith, The thinner or dryer agre, carrieth not the found so well as the more dense, &c.

Nathift. cent. 2.71. 143. CENT. 3. 71.217, 218.

The question is not, how many may meet together to heare, but how many may meet together to partake in all Ordinances of Church fellowship, especially in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper: And in this we appeale to our Brethren, whether they think the Myriads, Luke 12. 1. so thronged that they trod one upon another, could in that throng have received the Sacrament? and so for those other vast multitudes. in whose hearing (as they say) and in their sense, Moses, Ezra and Paul spake? or whether more thousands in one assembly may receive the Sacrament in a hot Countrey, then in a cold? and whether the heat of the Climate and purenesse of the ayre they speak of, will helpe more to meet in one roome, as well as to heare, as they conceive, at a more remote distance?

"The fourth Exception is a strong Argument for us; That this being Except.4. " the first Church, and whereof all the Apostles were Officers, those there-"fore who dwelt there (we adde upon the same ground, who were con-"verted there, and joyned in Church-fellowship with them) would s certainly abide together as one Church, till they came to the utmost propor-"tion, that the constitution of a Church is capeable of, a Maximum quod 66 sic, for the more united strength and glory of Religion and Christian com-" munion in holding forth the Name of Christ in one body.

We grant this, and therefore fay; That when the number of Beleevers was so increased, that they could not hold visible communion toge-

ther

ther in one assembly in all acts, they were inforced to divide themselves into distinct Congregations for acts of worship; yet that they might hold communion as far as it was possible, for acts of government, they continued one Church, one body; and supposing more Congregations there then one (which we conceive abundantly proved) judge whether it make more for the united strength and glory of Religion and Christian Communion in holding forth the Name of Christ in one body, that each of these Congregations should be so compleat a Church as to be Independent from all the rest; or that many of those Congregations should be united in one government, and so transact their affaires, communi consilio as one Church.

"Nor would their fift Exception much prejudice us should we grant the Except 5. "Whole. They had, say they, till Pauls persecution, the greatest liberty, and "freedome even to the utmost; they had favour with all the people, and the "Rulers durst not punish Peter and John for fear of the people, &c.

Bate something of the greatest liberty to the utmost, when Feter and Fohn immediately after the Miracles, and while they were preaching, were haled to prison before the peoples faces, Acts 4.1,3. and all the Apostles were laid hold of, put in the common Goale, threatned and beaten, Acts 5. 17, 18, 40. If we had such measures, we should not account it the greatest liberty to the utmost. The peoples favouring and magnifying them, only shewes they were not at that time active in the persecution, but all the Sanedrim were. For their not punishing of them by reason of the people, it was only that they durst not put them to death upon that occasion, the Miracle being so fresh and notorious: But secondly, Should we grant what our Brethren say, they had liberty to the utmost, we might from it more probably collect the increases of the Church to have been so many and great, that they could not but exceed the bounds of one single Congregation.

"They tell us, it was no new thing among the ferres, for Selts to have "great multitudes to cleave to them, and for them to baptise openly, as

"John Baptist and Christ did.

Surely it is not for the honour of Christ and his Apostles, to have the Christian Church thus ranckt with Setts: and to what purpose is this? Our Brethren will not say, there were no more of the Sect of the Pharifees then could meet in one place and make one Congregation, or that John and Christ baptized no more then could make one single Congregation; and if the liberty granted to other Setts made them so numerous, why may we not thinke that the number of Beleevers was farre greater then any of those Sects, the Apostles confirming their doctrine by so many Miracles?

THe Brethren having in the Assembly affirmed, that, though it should L be granted that the number of Beleevers in ferusalem before the dispersion was so great, that they could not meet together in one place: yet the perfecution fo wasted and scattered them, as that there were no more left then might meet in one Congregation. This ingaged the Assembly in a dispute about it, and after many dayes dispute it was refolved upon the question:

That the dispersion mentioned Acts 8. doth not prove such a scattering, as that there might not remain more Congregations then one in that Church: and for confirmation hereof were brought, Acts 9.31. Acts 12.24. Acts 21.20.

"Now against this Proposition our Brethren argue from the great-"Inesse of the Persecution that caused the dispersion, that it was " great for intension, reaching to imprisonment and death, Chap. 22.4. "And for extent, it reached to all forts both Preachers and Christians." "Acts 8.1. it is said indefinitly to be against the Church, and Verse 3. "its called an entring into every House, and haling Men and Women to "prison, and Chap. 20. Paul saith he imprisoned many of the Saints, not "Preachers only; and that this is an observable difference between this "persecution, and that mentioned, Acts 12. that there its said Herod "vexed certain of the Church; but here that Paul made havock of the

"Church, and that they were all scattered except the Apostles.

To which we answer, The persecution was indeed great and generall against all the Saints promiscuously, but therefore we conceive would make more Congregations in Ierusalem then there were before, though it made them smaller. They could not now meet in the Temple, daily, nor possibly at their wonted meeting houses: but yet certainly even then they had their meetings and Congregations. No terrors could make them for fake the assembling of themselves together. In that other persecution, Acts 12. we find the Church assembled in severall places. They were praying in the house of Mary, ver. 12. there was one; to which Peter comes and tells them the manner of his delivery, and bids them go and tell it to Iames and to to the Brethren, there was another : fo it was in that persecution, and so it might be (nay was likely to be) in this.

"No say our Brethren, for the Text saith expressy they were all scattered

" except the Apostles.

To which we answer, they All must be understood either of all the Beleevers, or all the Teachers and Church Officers in the Church of Ierusalem, except Beleevers; but it cannot be understood of all the Beleevers. that they all were scattered, and therefore it must be understood of Teachers, and that for two Reasons. First,

7 3.1.

Object.

First, because the Particle Addrussed with the Genitive case in the New Ioh. 8. 10.

Testament, is alwaics exceptive to the utmost; and therefore (ac-Act. 15. 28 cording to our Brethrens sense) would imply that there was not one Beleever left in Iernsalem besides the Apostles, which cannot be. For the Text saith that Paul broke into houses, and haling Men and Women, committed them to prison, ver. 3. and this he did in Ierusalem, Act. 26.

10. Therefore all the Beleevers were not scattered abroad through the Regions of Indea, Galilee, and Samaria, some of them were in prison at Ierusalem; and to what purpose can we imagine did the Apostles (who in all their motions and staies were directed by the Spirit of God) tarry at Ierusalem, unlesse it were to comfort and support the Church there, in the rage of this persecution which had scattered their other Officers and Teachers from them?

Secondly, it appears that they were the Teachers who were thus all feattered except the Apostles, for it is there said, They that were scatte-

red, went every where preaching the Word, ver.4.

"To this our Brethren reply, That is not only called Teaching which is "by way of Sermon to a multitude; for ver. 25. of this Chapt. 'tis said "that Philip taught the Eunuch in a private conference, and Aquila and "Priscilla taught Apolo's.

But we answer, the Text speaks not of teaching, but of preaching, they went every where ¿vayyerizóuevos τὸν λόγον, preaching the Word: Teaching may be Actus charitatis, but Preaching is Actus officis, how can

they preach except they be sent? Rom.10.

"But they are not called evaryonistic, as having an an office, but ev ment Objects "Zówerow, as referring to an act, and it was ordinary in those times for men "that were not by office Ministers, occasionally to teach the word in private "converse and otherwise, and these went out by persecution not by "mission.

That in those times Men not in office did teach by private converse Answ. we deny not, but we speak not here of teaching but of preaching, and if ἐναγγελιζούμενοι τὸν λόγον refer to the act, yet to the act as men in office, Luke 8.1." we desire our Brethren to produce one text of Scripture, where Luke 9.6. ἐναγγελιζόμενοι τὸν λόγον is used of any that are not Preachers by office; Luke 20.1. we can bring many where tis used of those that are, even by the Pen- Act. 8.12. man of this History; so that we conclude that these ἐναγγελιζόμενοι τὸν Act. 10.36 λόγον had their Commission to preach before, though this persecution occasioned their mission into Indea and other places to preach there.

"But can we think (say they) the Teachers were scattered, and the ordi-Object.
"nary Beleevers were not; except we suppose the people more conragious

" to stay by it, then their Teachers?

We dare not say that those that are scattered in a time of persecution Answ.

200

78.4.

2,

3.

118.8

are lesse couragious then those that stay and suffer. In Queen Maries dayes many Preachers sted beyond sea; whether it were that God had present imploiment for them there, or did it to reserve them for suture service in their return home, we do not say; but we dare not say that they were lesse couragious then those that staid by it, and died for it. In the late times of Prelaticall rage and persecution many were scattered into forrein parts, whilst others that did abide by it had triall of cruell mockings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonments, shall we say, that those were lesse couragious then these?

But should we grant that this dispersion was not only of the Teachers, but of the multitude of Beleevers, we yet might answer, Secondly, that though this persecution was great, yet it was but short; and it cannot be imagined, but they who were scattered by the persecution, would upon the ceasing of it return again to Ierusalem, and that upon the

grounds laid down by our Brethren in their fourth exception.

Should we grant they were so scattered that they never returned to Ierusalem again, Yet this doth not weaken our Proposition or the main proof of it; because we must rather look to the first frame of that Church, then to their condition under persecution, which was but accidentall; so that our Brethren either mistake themselves, or wrong us, when they say that we build an It may be upon an It might be.

For we proved our it may be by the State of the Church of Ierusalem before the dispersion, and only to take off an Objection made by them, we say it might be that after the dispersion there were more Beleever's in Ierusalem then could meet in one place. And to prove this we bring Asts 9.31. where its said the persecution ceasing, the Churches were multiplied, or according to the Originall in Asts 12.24, the word of God grew and multiplied: and Asts 21.20, where we read of many thousands or Myriads of Iewes which beleeved. To which our Brethren except as followeth.

"First to that Acts 9.31. they say, that ἐπληθύνον doth not signifie or"dinarily a great number made up, but an increase in measure, not in
"number; so Mat. 24.12. t Pet. 1.2. Grace be multiplied, &c. Secondly,
"They are the Churches of Judea, Galilee, and Samaria, that are there
"spoken of; and what is that to prove more in the Church of Ierusalem
"then could meet in one?

A&6.1. Whereto we reply first, that the word πληθόνω doth properly signific to A&6.7. increase in number, and not in measure, and accordingly is translated A&7.17. to be multiplied. Πληθός the Noune from whence its derived, in the whole New Testament is translated multitude, and this Verbe that commeth of it throughout the whole book of the A&Is, when applied to the Church, is only so used and accordingly translated. Nor can it being

applied

applied to persons be otherwise understood, what ever it may of sinnes and graces in the Texts by them produced, yet even in them the word is capable of this construction as might easily be showne, were it need-

full or expedient.

Secondly, though they be the Churches of Judea, Galilee and Samaria that are mentioned, yet the Church of Jerusalem therein must needs be contained and included. First, if ferusalem were in Judea; secondly, it being expressed, on I saula all, or whole Indea, of which ferusalem was a part; and this thirdly, not in contra-distinction to ferusalem, as in some other places, as Mar. 1.5: Matth. 4.25. Acts 26. 12. but to Samaria and Galilee, in which construction ferusalem (not being named) is included, as Mark 3.7. Acts 10. 37. should we say the Churches of all England, and Scotland, and Ireland, are in a Covenant? would not any common understanding take the Churches of London to be included here? Nay, fourthly, were Juden set alone by it self, yet it may and doth include ferusalem, which our Brethren cannot upon good ground deny. In Luke 1.5. Luke 3.1. Acts 28.21. Acts 11. 1, 29 1 Thes. 2.14. and which themselves in Ads 15.1. do upon another occasion and lesse reason affert, where they will have Indea notonly to include Ierusalem, but will needs have it put for Ierusalem. Fifthly, if our Brethren say that the Church of ferusalem was not included in these Churches of Indea, that had rest, and were edified and multiplied, they must shew that it then was troubled and lessened: but fixthly, if other Churches of Indea were so increased and multiplied, we may conclude the Church of Ierusalem, who had a greater proportion of meanes, even the Ministry of the whole Colledge of the Apostles, was multiplied much more; so that all the Beleevers there could not for all Acts of Worship meet together in one Congregation.

To Act. 12.24. our Brethren except nothing. But to Act. 21.20. they fav. "First, that it was the Feast of Pentecost when Paul came to Jerusalem "( as they would prove by this journall) and therefore no wonder if he found "thousands of the beleeving Iemes there, that were come up from all quar-"ters; and verse 27. some of them are extrelly said to be Iewes of Asia, "not of Judea. Secondly, the word puggic being put alone without any word "of number, signifieth only a greater multitude, aspusion and oc, &c. and being "put indefinitely, is all one, as to say thousands or many. To which we answer.

To the first, that we contend not much whether Paul came to Ierusa- Answ. , lem by Pentecost or no, as not making much either against us or for us. Some that lay he was at Ierusalem at Pentecost, think he came thither eight or ten daies before: but so timely before the Feast those Myriads were not likely come up, it being the time of their Wheat-harvest, which needlefly they would not absent themselves from & which some conceive

was the reason why this Feast of Pentecost was but of one day, whereas the two other Anniversary Feasts continued seven dayes.

Wolch Ptolomy mares 25. miles from 2307 e. Miletus was from Ephelus

Ptolomy 45. miles. Merc. makes it above 50: Chrysoft. indeavours a cemputa. dayes, but it is butconjectu-747.

But we suppose our Brethren know its controverted, whether Paul were at ferusalem at this Peast or no? and denied by some; and if we also should deny it, it will be hard for them to demonstrate it, till they Troas, some can manifest how long after the dayes of unleavened bread Pauls joura great deal ney began, chap. 20. 6. how long he was going on foot to Assos, vers. 13. and from thence to Mitylena, vers. 14 how long he tarried at Trogyllium, vers. 15. how long at Miletus, before he sent for the El. ders at Ephesus, (some say of Asia,) ver. 17. how long it was before according to they could come, ver. 18. how long he continued there before he departed, ver. 38. how long in passing thence to Choos, chap. 21. 1. and some Rhodes to Patara in the same verse, and how long he stayed there, and then how long from his fetting forth from thence, till leaving Cyprus he sailed to Syria, and landed at Tyre, ver. 2,3. how long in passing from thence to Prolomais, ver. 7. how many those many dayes were that he stayed at Philips house, ver. 10. and how long he was going thence tion of these to ferusalem, and the very day he arrived there; none of which are in the Story particularly expressed, and then adding the many dayes befides which are fet down, Chap. 20. 6,7, 15. Chap. 21. 1,4,7,8. Thew that all these amount not to above 42 dayes, for Paul had no more to finish his course in for Philippi to Jerusalem, however the Brethren to make it probable that he was there at Pentecost, lengthen the time, and shorten the way, from these 42 dayes they make eight weekes, and make it about forty miles from Tyre to Jerusalem, whereas measuring in a direct line, it was 90; but that way which Paul went, coasting by Ptolomais and Casarea, it was very neare 120.

> But secondly, should we grant Our Brethren that he was there at Pentecost, we mult yet put them to another proofe of all the feme's among the Gentiles, being bound or wonted to come to this Feast (it especially being but of one day) from all quarters, of which we shall

speake more hereafter.

Thirdly, say all did, yet we can by no meanes yeeld that the fewes of Asia, mentioned ver. 27, 28. were of this great multitude of beleeving Fewes, mentioned ver. 20. Seeing the Text is plaine, that they were

Persecutors rather then Beleevers.

Fourthly, nay none of the beleeving femes that were among the Gentiles, must be included in these Myriads, for they are clearely distinguished from them, the words are plaine, that the Myriads of beleeving Fewes were informed that Paul taught all the Fewes among the Gentiles, &c. They then are informed that Paul had taught others. The Jewes among the Gentiles were they whom Paul had so taught, and how could they

they be in the number of them that were informed, had they need to be

informed by others, what Paul had taught themselves?

Fifthly, they therefore must either be the beleeving fewes of ferusalem only; and then we have more then we need, or at most they must be the beleeving fewes in fudea only, and if so, thence we argue, if there were no or fungiases, so many ten thousands of beleevers in Judea, there must be some ten thousands, at least, one ten thousand in Jerusalem for her part, that will make more then one Congregation, which might meet for all Ordinances in one place; if so many, where lesse meanes, then a greater number proportionably must be in Ferusalem, where the Apostles were preaching daily in the Temple, and from House to House, and that for two and twenty yeares together, and therefore it cannot but be very strange, that in all that time of the Gospels Spring in so populous a City, All of them should convert no more to the Faith then might make up but one Congregation.

Sixthly, how do Our Brethren in the fixth reason, whereby they would prove that the number of Beleevers in Jerusalem were no more then might meet in one place, make use of the very next ver. 22. to that purpole, where it is said, how is it therefore? The multitude must needs come together: Sure the multitude there are no other then the Myriads in this ver. 21. and we conceive Our Brethren then took that multitude to be

of the Church of Ferusatem, whatever they do now.

"But if it be said that nothing can be argued from the word uvpiases which " as mugns being put without addition of another mord of number, signifieth "only indefinitely very many. We answer, first, Our Brethren in their third exception out of Luke 12. 1. translate this word un'grades Myriads, and there stretch it to the utmost extent, and thereby prove that one mans voice may be heard by Myriads at once, which no man can beleeve; but here they would shrink the fignification of it, to be a lesse number, when we would improve its proper sense and latitude, to shew the exceeding great numbers of Beleevers in Jerusalem, or in all Judea (for either will serve our turne) which they cannot deny, but might reach to fo many.

Secondly, they found in their Book the Adjective uspess put indefinitely, as μύριον πλήθος and some other such like, which might have been transcribed, but there they found not an instance of the Substantive Mupias fo used, else it would have been added: which we could have desired might have been, or any wherein it signifieth fewer then ten thousand,

fure it doth not in such instances as we meet with Alts 19.19. Rev. 5.11. 2974914 "Thirdly, they sceme to intimate that uveras Without the addition of a- pustas as "nother word of number might signific fewer then ten thousand as if such "" a word added heightned its signification, whereas we finde in Scripture ces of sil-

that yer.

that it stints it rather to his precise signification of 10000 and no more, as A&. 19.19. but when it is alone by it self its lest, free to reach to a greater number self e number, as in those Myriads of Saints, Jude 12. & Angels, Heb. 12.22.

To their answer to the second proof of the first head from the many Apostles and other Preachers in the Church of ferusalem, &c.Our Brethren say,

First, for the Apostles.

"First, they took all opportunities to fill their hands with worke, Preaching daily in the Temple, and from House to House, Asts 5.22. chap. 226. Paul also in Ephesus taught publikely in the Congregation and from house house, Asts 20.20.

" Secondly, when any in Judea, or elsewhere, were converted, the A-

postles went abroad, Chap. 8.

"Thirdly, How were the twelve imployed, when for forty dayes together, "they met together in an upper roome, & had but one hundred and twenty for a Flock?

We reply to the first Ansmer.

Resp. ad primum.

Ad 2.

Ad 3.

First, because the Apostles tooke all opportunities to fill their hands with worke, therefore they distributed their many thousands into severall Congregations, that they might all be at work at once in an orderly way, otherwise though they might preach occasionally, yet they could have had no settled way, and opportunity of imploying themselves in the work of the Ministry.

Secondly, their preaching daily in the Temple, and from house to house, confirmes this; they preached in the Temple to the promiscuous multitude, whilest they had their proper Church meetings in more pri-

vate houses.

Thirdly, this is yet further confirmed by what our Brethren fay of Paul, who taught publikely, and from house to house: for if Paul could doe both these workes at Ephesus himselfalone; why might not Peter, James and John, doe as much at Jerusalem? especially if but one Congregation: so that by this Argument the rest of the Apostles might have been spared, and yet that one Congregation sufficiently instructed.

To their second, of the Apostles going forth to erect other Churches, they can give but one instance of it, Asts the &. where the whole

twelve went not forth, but only two were fent.

To the third, we say first, our Brethren mistake forty daies for ten, at most, for no more were there from Christs Assention, (upon which they went up into that upper chamber, Acts 1.13,14.) to Pentecost, Acts 2.1.

Secondly, as in those forty daies which they mentioned, the Apostles were imployed not in Preaching, but in Learning from Jesus Christ the

things

things pertaining to the Kingdome of God, Alts 1.3. so in those ten daies which they meant, they were taken up, especially in Prayer and Supplication, Alts 1.14. waiting for the promise of the Spirit, surther to inable them to the work of the Ministry, and of them so fitted and filled with the Spirit, we meant in our Argument.

For the many Teachers, they say;

"There were then many gifted men that were not Officers, which yet cocasionally instructed others, as Aquilla did Apollos, those gifts were so plentifull, that in that one Church of Corinth, almost every one of them had them, I Cor. 14.26. and yet not Officers, for else there would have been almost as many Teachers as Members, and the powring out of the Holy "Ghost (more ordinary then) did not make every man a Teacher by Office, "for then all those in Samaria should have been Teachers, A&S 8.

"Elders in the Ordination of Deacons, Acts 6. in which Elders (had there been nany) had an interest, and would have been named as well as the A-postles, as they are, Acts 15. When once there were Elders, but Deacons were the sirst sort of Ossicers that were chosen, and till their choice the

"Apostles managed all. As for the first part of their Answer;

1. First, We grant in those times were many gifted men that were not in Office, which might occasionally instruct others, as Aquila did

Apollos.

2. But fecondly, We did never say, that Congregations were to be multiplied according to the number of gifted men, or that there should be almost as many Teachers as Church members, to which our Brethren

rather propend in the practise of their Congregations.

3. Thirdly, But this instructing occasionnally, was either in private, and then its nothing to the purpose, or in publick, and so it cannot be meant, for not only Aquila, but also Priscilla his wife instructed Apollos, and our Brethren will not say wemen may (no not occasi-

onally) in publick.

4. Fourthly, Our Brethren cannot conclude that 2/2505, I Cor. 14.266. fignifieth simply, all, or almost all, but all, or every one that were so qualified, as Luke 13.5. Doth not 2050s every one of you loose his Ox or his Asse, &c. and I Cor. 7.2. Let 2/2505 every one of you have his own Wife, &c. not meant of all in generall, but of every one that had an Ox, &c. or had need of a wife, and so in that place of the Corinths.

Reas.2. To the second part of this answer we reply;

1. That it will not follow, because Elders are not mentioned Ast. 6. therefore then there were none; We find no mention of Elders in Ierusalem, till Asts 11. will our Brethren therefore say, there were none till then? The truth is, we reade nothing at all in Scripture, of

the time or occasion of ordaining Elders in that Church, and therefore lesse can be said about it.

Secondly, Yet the current of Expositors say, that the seventy Disciples were at Ierulalem among those hundred and twenty Names, of whom we reade, Acts 1. who were Teachers by Office, and if so, then all the work of Administration of all forts did not lie only upon the Apostles

hands, as our Brethren affirm.

Thirdly, We have already proved, that those who were scattered from Ierusalem, were Preachers by Office before the dispersion, and our Brethren grant, that after the dispersion there were Elders there, so that both before and after the dispersion, there were many Teachers and Officers there, which is an argument of many Congregations there.

To their Reasons against the third Proof of the first head, from the diversity of Languages among the Beleevers.

7 Nto our third Proof of divers Congregations at Ierusalem by the V diversity of Languages there, Att. 2. 6. the first Answer that our " Brethren make is, That tis true indeed that there were in the second of "Acts, out of all Nations, that heard the Apostles speak in the severall "Languages of the Countries they were born in, but yet those mereall ei-"ther Iews or Proselytes' Eunafeis morshippers, as ver. 5. who came up to

" worship, and some parts of the worship were Audible.

I. We observe that our Brethren translate Eudas Worshippers for their own advantage, not having either the Propriety of the word, the use of it in the Scripture, or the Concurrence of Interpreters to bear them out in such a translation. The advantage they seek for, is, because they would colour it the better that these Companies now asfembled at Ierusalem came up to Worship; or as they explain it elsewhere, that they came up to Pentecost. But this follows not, because they were dwelling at Ierusalemat this Feast of Pentecost, that therefore they came up to this Feast, or to worship only, as we touched before.

For First, the Iews that dwelt without the Land of Canaan were not

bound to appearance at the Festivalls there.

Secondly, nor was it possible that they should so do, if they had been commanded, unlesse they did nothing almost all the year but go up to Ierusalem, and home again, their habitation being some of them so many months Journy distant.

Thirdly, what had the dispersed Iews to do at the Feast of Harvest (for so it is called Exod.23.16.) when their Harvest in very many of

those places where they dwelt was not yet begun?

Fourthly, if their distance from Ierusalem made them to choose to

7 2.6.

come up but to some one of the Feasts, and omit the rest, why to Pentecost, which was the least Solemn of all the three, rather then to the Passeover or Tabernacles, these two being Solemnities for a whole

week, Pentecost but for a day.

Fiftly, we produce a more probable reason before (as we suppose) of this matchlesse and unparalell'd concourrse at this time, for so we doubt not to call it, viz. that the Iews had learned by the Scripture, and especially out of the Prophesse of Daniel, that this was the time when the Kingdom of Heaven should appear, as it is apparent both out of Luke, chap. 19.ver. 11. and out of the Iews own Authors, and therefore came in those multitudes to Ierusalem, and there settled to dwell, to see the sulfilling of those things that all the Nations so much looked after.

2. Although it were true, that all these dispersed ones came up to worship, and though the worship in some parts of it were Audible, yet can it be no sound arguing to infer thereupon, that therefore all that came to worship understood what was said in it; especially seeing that the worship at the Temple was not so much to hear, as to offer.

"They proceed thus: And though born in other Countries (the Iewes being dispersed) yet all were generally learned and understood the Hebrew tongue, the Language of their own Nation, even as to this day the Iews

"and their children do.

First, that the dispersed Iems were so generally learned, is by far, sooner said then proved; even they of Ierusalem were scorned by the learned men there, as Ignorant in the Law, Ioh. 7.49. and Iosephus seemeth to testifie the clean contrary to what our Brethren assert.

We more wonder at their affertion concerning the *Iews* dispersed being so learned, unlesse they can shew us some Universities, Synagogues, Schooles, or some means of raising learning, in *Media, Parthia*,

and other places, which we never yet have feen or heard of.

To what an unacquaintednesse with the Law, and with that learning we are now speaking of, the people were grown in the seventy years captivity may be collected out of the book of Nehemiah: And how these dispersed ones now in mention should come to be so learned, when their dispersion was so vastly, wider, and the continuance of it so incomparably longer, we confesse we cannot apprehend, histories do not evidence, and we suppose our Brethren will not be able to demonstrate.

Secondly, by the Hebrew tongue we conceive our Brethren underftand not the Language properly so called, for its so clear both by writings of learned men, and by the Scripture it self, that that was not the vulger Language of the Nation at those times that we are speaking of, that we cannot once suspect that they mean that tongue, but the mixed

Syriack,

Jesus Syriack, of which we have some small parcels in the New Testament, and some larger peeces in the Iewish writers, which indeed is called Hebrew, Ioh. 19.13, 17. and the Hebrew Dialect, Acts 21.40. and Acts 22.2. not because it was the proper Hebrew tongue, but the proper tongue of the Hebrews at this time, Acts 1.19.

We are indifferent whether Language they mean, for we deny that the *Iews* born in other countries did generally understand the one or

the other.

First, the Septuagint translation was the Bible they had then in common use, both in their Synagogues, and in their studies, as is apparent both by the quotations of the Apostles, and of Philo, and Iosephus, and is hinted by Tertullian.

Secondly, the Prophets were translated out of Hebrew into Caldee a little before the coming of Christ, and the Law a little after, to make

them the more intellegible.

Thirdly, even *Philo* himself one of the learnedest of the Nation, and one that was alive at this very time of which we are speaking, doth sometimes bewray his unskilfulnesse, if not his totall ignorance in the pure *Helrew* tor gu.

And whence then came their skilfulnesse in the Hebrew tongue so common and generall as our Brethren conceive, if they meane this

Language?

Secondly, as for the Syriack, which was indeed the Language of the

Nation at this time, we offer these things likewise.

First, that there was no part of Scripture written in that Language. Secondly, that there was but little exposition of Scripture, or indeed none at all in that Language that did then go up and down among all *Iems* that were dispersed.

Thirdly, that it is questionable, whether the Audible parts of worship

at the Temple were in this Language, or no?

Fourthly, that though it were, yet will our Brethren hardly ever finde a reason or argument, that might perswade all the Iews under heaven therefore to study, and get that Syriack Language, because it was spoken at Ierusalem.

Fifthly, there is so much difference of Language in the two Talmuds, and in the two Targums: and other Authors that were neer to this time, as may somewhat argue that all the Nation did not so generally

understand that one Language all alike.

Sixthly, Philo himself appears to be unskilfull in it, when he translates

a most common Syriack word, only upon other mens report.

Seventhly, though it were granted our Brethren, that all the men among the dispersed Iems understood the Syriack, obtaining it by study;

yet how will they make it good for women, of which there were some

store of company there?

Eighthly, especially, how will they make it good of Proselites? for that Romans, Cappadocians, Cretians, or any of those Nations of the western dispersion, whose Language had no affinity at all with the Syrian or Hebrew tongue, if they converted to the Hebrews Religion, should also be skiled in the Syrian tongue, requires a stronger reason to e-vince, then we expect can be yet shewed us.

How learned the *Iews* and their children are at this day our *Brethren*mention, but we see no proof for it. It may be they have met with some
that have attained to good skill in the Scriptures, and Hebrew
tongue, but this is not proof for the generall. 'Tis true indeed they have
their prayers & Service in their Synagogues in the Hebrew tongue, but
this no more proveth that they generally understand Hebrew, then it argueth that the Papists generally understand Latine, because they have
their Latine Service: And yet also have we seen the *Iews* prayers in Spanish, & Italian tongues, though written indeed with the Hebrew letter.

"The Assertion, That all the dispersed Iews understood the Hebrew tongue our Brethren think is evident in Acts c.20.2 1.22, where Paul coming up with divers Grecians to the Feast of Pentecost, c.20. ver. 4. unto which the Iews out of all quarters came, and being at a solemn meeting in the Temple, chap. 21. ver. 27. the Iews out of Asia, strangers, stirred up all the people against him, and when chap. 22. ver. 2. he made a speech to them, and when they heard he spake the Hebrew tongue, they kept silence,

" and heard him patiently.

Whether Paul were at the Feast of Pentecost mentioned in this story, we refer to what we have said before, and that the Iews out of all quarters came to that Feast we deny: If we should grant all that our Brethren speak in this passage, what doth it prove of their opinion? because that Panl being accused by the Iews of Asia, to the Iems of Ierusalem, and affaulted by the Iems of Ierusalem, when he maketh a speech to them to whom he was accused, and by whom he was assaulted, in the Hebrew tongue, they heard him patiently, because he spake in their own tongue; Ergo, all the dispersed Iems of all Countries wheresoever understood that tongue: It is a consequence so far fetched, and so strangely inferred, that we can rather wonder at such Logick, then find any strength in such Argumentation. If we should put them to prove that these Asian Iews that accused Paul (to meddle with none other) understood his Apologie, we suppose they could give us but little satisfa-Clion in it: Nay, may we not retort their instance and argument against themselves thus? That if the Iews of Ierusalem took Paul for a lew as it is most probable they did, they expected at first that he could not have

spoken their Language, which when they heard him do, they gave him the more attention.

A second instance they produce, is the peoples understanding Peters

Sermon, Acts chap. 2.

"And further (lay they) those mentioned, Acts chap. 2. did understand "all of them Peters Sermon: And though others spake unto them besides "Peter in their own Language the Wonderfull things of God, yet that was "but a preparative signe to them: As first epistle to Corinthians, chap.14. "ver.22. making way for their conversion, ver. 11,12 13. but the meanes" of their conversion was Peters Sermon, afterwards, and it was he that gave direction to them all what to do to be saved. And therefore it must be spoken of some common Language they all understood.

"And those gifts of Languages given to the Apostles were not of necessity to instruct these new converts only, but to sit them when they should go abroad into all the world, and to be a sign to the Jewes at present to convince them.

We desire a proofe, that *Peter* alone preached and converted these three Thousand. It is true indeed that mention is only made of *Peters* Speech, yet doth not this in *Lukes* stile, nor indeed re ipsa exclude the

preaching of the other Apostles. For

First, observe in Asts, chap. 3. ver. 12. it is said Peter answered the people, and his speech is only recorded without any mention at all of Iohns, and yet chap. 4. ver. 1. it is said Aanswaw 2044, declaring plainly that Iohn spake as well as he; so againe, chap. 4. ver. 8. it is said Peter spake to them, and his speech only recorded, and yet in ver. 13. it is said, they saw the boldnesse of Iohn as well as Peter.

Secondly observe, that though Luke in this Book of the Alts of the Apostles intended to declare the growth of the Gospel, and of the Church, by the Ministry of all the Apostles and Disciples that had their share in it, yet doth he fix more especially upon the storie of those that were respectively Ministers of the circumcision and uncircumcision by a more peculiar designation, as Peter and Iohn, more especially Peter;

Paul and Barnabas, more especially Paul.

Thirdly, when he particularizeth so much concerning Peter, and so little concerning the rest of the twelve, he doth not thereby intimate any whit lesse zeal or activity for the propagation of the Gospel in them, then in him, but he chooseth rather to insist upon, and sollow the storie of Peter, partly (it may be) because his great fall in the denials of his Master required the greater testimony of his recoverie, and partly or chiefly because he was more singularly designed for a Minister of the Circumcision, therefore is he the man most spoken of while the storie followeth the Church of the Circumcision.

Fourthly, observe that in Acts, chap. 2. ver. 14. it is said Peter stood forth

Dissenting Brethre n, against the Instance of the Church of Jerusalem.

forth with the eleven: Now if the eleven were filent in this action, and

Auditours only as well as others, why are they mentioned?

Againe it is said, ver.37. They were pricked in their hearts, and said to Peter, and to the rest of the Apostles, What shall me do? why should they aske counsell of the rest of the Apostles as well as Peter, if they had not preached to them as well as he? and likewise in ver. 42. it is said they continued in the doctrine of the Apostles,  $A\pi \nu \pi \delta \lambda \omega \nu$  in the plurall.

Fiftly, Peter laieth to the charge of these to whom he speaketh, the death of Christ, now there were in that number, Asts chap. 2. divers

Proselites, ver. 10. who had no hand at all in his death.

Sixtly, the pointing in vers. 41. is considerable where it is said, Those that received Peters words were baptized, and then as speaking of another storie he saith, There were added the same day three thousand soules.

All these things considered, we have good cause to doubt whether Peter alone preached at this time, and whether he alone was the converter of these three thousand, and whether he alone gave them direction

what to do.

Our Brethren conclude this passage thus, Those gifts of languages were not of a necessity to instruct those new Converts only, but to fit them when they should go abroad into all the world, and to be a signe to the Jewes at

present to convince them.

Whereas they say those gifts of Languages given to the Apostles were not of necessity to instruct those new converts only, we say so likewise; but our meaning is, that those gifts were of necessity to instruct those new converts, but not to instruct them only, but to sit the Apostles against they should go abroad into all the world: And if our Brethren mean not so, let them leave out the word only, and we shall know then what to say to them: but here we cannot tell what to say to them, be-

cause we cannot clearly tell what they mean.

Tis true indeed that tongues were for a fign, and it is past gain-saying, first Epistle to Corinthians, chap. 14. ver. 22. But that they were given for a figne as for the proper end, we do utterly deny it: For we know that the gift of healing and power of casting out devills were for a sign, but we suppose our Brethren will not say that that was the proper end why they were given: but for the benefit of the people in healing and dispossessing. And since the nature of the gift doth import a necessity of it in the parties to whom it was applied, as healing and dispossessing argued sicknesses and possessessing to since the very nature of the gift of tongues doth imply instruction, we cannot but apprehend a necessity of it in those persons to whom it was used: for it seemeth monstrous to us that the solemne promise of the Father given in so glorious a manner, and so wondrous a thing in it selfe, should be more for a signe to them

Gg 2

that

that beleeved not, then for any benefit for those that did: And that that gift which had been so highly Prophesied of before, and so highly Magnissed now, and so great a gift of the spirit in it selfe, should be but for this purpose, to speak strange Languages to them that could have understoodall of them one Language if it had been spoken; what a needlesse supersuity of the gifts of the spirit would our Brethren have here, who will have such a thing as this only for a signe to the sew while the Apostles were among them? We have ever held that the gift of tongues was for the calling in of the people to the knowledge and profession of God and Religion, as the consustion of tongues had been their casting out, and we have ever thought the gift it selfe to be of an instructive nature, and why it should not be so to the sews here we see no cause.

The Apostle indeed saith in the place cited, Tongues are for a signe, but he implies also in the verse preceding, that they were given for this end, that the people might heare; With men of other tongues and other lips will I speake unto this people, and yet for all this will they not heare. Instruction was the proper end of Languages, as it is of preaching, yea though the wicked receive it not; and the Languages now given had no end at all, if the people had no need of them.

The Apostles indeed were fitted with this gift against they should go

into all the world; but let our Brethren consider these things.

First, how long it was before any of the Gentiles were gone and preached unto by any of the Apostles: let them looke either into the Ecclesiasticall Histories, or seriously examine the Text, and they shall finde that it was divers yeares before they preached to any but the lews. and then what should they have done with so many tongues for these divers yeares being to preach only to Iews that understood all of them one Language? If we should put our Brethren to it, to prove that the Apostles were gone abroad into all the world before the Councell at Ierusalem, which was at the least seventeen yeares, or before the Apprehension of Paul at Ierusalem, Alts 21.30. which was at least two and twenty yeares after this gift, they would have much ado to prove it: and why should they think that they should have this gift which was thought a great and glorious one for so long a time (or grant the time to have been shorter) and never put it to any but a kinde of needlesse use, not for any benefit of the people but that they might as well have been without?

Secondly, sure it is, that Iames lived and died at Ierusalem, and for ought that can be found, never departed from thence while he lived: now certainly he had the gift of tongues as well as the other Apostles: and to what purpose had he it if he were continually to preach

to those that could have as well understood him in the mother tongue?

I, but fay they, it was to be a sign to the Iewes at present to convince them: To convince them, how? if by the things spoken, why those might have convinced them if they had been spoken in the Syrian tongue only, which our Brethren say all the people understood: if by the Miracle that those Galileans should speak so many tongues, why some of the people took this for so little a Miracle that they said they were full of new wine: now therefore when the Apostles had in their hands the power of healing, casting out devil's, killing by a word, and raising the dead, and such like signs as spake conviction by the very exercise of them, we cannot but hold it strange to conceive that speaking of divers tongues should be thought to be added as a bare sign, and for no other use, then what those other gifts would have done abundantly without it.

Our Brethren to our second Quotations of Acts, chap. 6. do make

this answer.

"Secondly, for the Grecian Widowes, Acts chap. 6. the Hellenists that lived among the Jews might well be supposed to understand Hebrew.

Not to spend time upon this Expression (the Hellenists that lived among the Iewes) which to divers Learned men would appeare Barbarisme, the Hellenists being conceived by them to be Iewes themselves that lived among the Greeks, and not Greeks that lived among the Iews, as our Brethren seem to us to conceive, how well they might be supposed to understand Hebrew by our Brethren we know not; as for our selves, we know not any such ground (that considered that hath been spoken before) as to suppose for the generality of the Hellenists any such thing.

"They conclude thus; And that these had not severall Congregations from the rest appeares by this, that the whole multitude together met and chose the Deacons; it was a joynt ast: And if of differing Languages wherein the one understood not the other, occasioning such a distinction of Congregations [as the proofe would hold forth] how could they all have

"agreed in one meeting on the same man?

We answer; here are two things taken for granted by our Brethren, which are yet to prove; First, that all the whole multitude of Beleevers in Iernsalem met to choose the Peacons: And secondly, that they

agreed in one meeting on the same man.

We might here answer what we have done before, that the whole multitude in Scripture stile doth not alwayes signifie all and singular persons of such a company, but sometimes many of that company, and sometimes only such as were present at the occasion mentioned: Yet if we should take the whole multitude in the Text, in the sense that our Brethren do, for all the thousands of Beleevers, none excepted, yet is

G:g: 3

the

the Affertion far from being proved still; for the Text indeed saith, The twelve called all the multitude when they propounded the matter of the choise of Deacons; but it cannot be found, that all the multitude met for their choosing, unlesse they chose them at that very instant, which is very questionable, and so is it whether they agreed in one meeting on the same man: for were it granted, that the people agreed in one tongue, yet certainly were they of severall Nations; and how so many Nations, so farre distant for habitation, should in so short a time as a Festivall season, come so acquainted one with another, and all with these Seven, as to agree in one meeting on one man, is so difficult to imagine, that we cannot vet be convinced of it: but must rather conceive, that upon the Apostles motioning the matter to the whole multitude (take it if you will in the largest comprehension) that they departed, and considered and consulted of the businesse, every Nation whom it concerned, among themselves, or the most Neighbouring-Nations one with another, and chose their men; and all having thus chosen, present them joyntly to their Ordination. And such choises as these of Officers in feverall Companies, yet all those that are chosen, brought at last into one body, hath been and is so common, that it needeth no exemplifying.

"But in the wrapping up of all, they use our weapon against our selves, and say, That the Argument as well holds against the Presbyteriall Association of those Congregations into one Church, People and Elders, unto Which, and in the Communion and Exercise whereof, such Correspondencies und intercourses are needfull, as they re-

"quire one common Language.

Nay, it holds nothing neare so well against the Presbyteriall Association into one Church, unlesse it were true, that the Elders of the Congregation, and the common Members were alike learned. And it is no consequence at all, that because the people could not all of them understand one Sermon, nor could all joyne in the Sacrament, because they could not understand one anothers speech, that therefore the Elders could not understand one another to joyne in Government. Nor that a people that understand not one common language, may not joyne in one body under one Presbyteriall Government, as well as they may joyne in one Corporation, and in one civill Government.

The second branch of this Argument, That all these Congregations were under one Presbyteriall-Government.

## PROOFS.

1. Proof. 1. B Fcause they were one Church.

To which our Brethren answer, "Though it be one, yet " they not being more then could meet in one, the Argument concludes not Rep. 1. So then its granted to be a concluding Argument, if there were more in that one Church then could meet in one Congregation for all acts of worship, which whether we have not sufficiently proved, we freely leave to those who shall impartially weigh our former Ar-

guments to determine.

2. Suppose the number of Beleevers there had been no greater then might possibly have met in one, how can our Brethren prove that they did not, for better convenience of Administrations, or some other ends, meet in distinct and severall Assemblies? Some of the new gathered Churches in London are not so numerous, but that three or foure of them might very well meet in one Assembly, yea possibly they have met, Two Churches at a Sacrament, Three or four Churches at a Fast or at a Lecture, though they are no more then might meet in one place.

2. Proof. Because the Elders of that Church are mentioned.

Against which our Brethren except, "1. That there is no mention of any " Elder of that Church, till after the dispersion, Acts 8. and so the weight " of the Argument depends upon the proof of many Congregations after the "dispersion, which the Reverend Assembly doth not possitively affirm: "This is the sum of what is argumentative. 2 What follows, tends only to " prove, that we dispute in circulo, and against Presbyterian Principles.

We fay,

1. As before, (Their repeating of Exceptions necessitating us to repeat Answers) That our not reading of Elders before the dispersion, doth not prove that there were none before it; The order of Existence is not alwayes to be gathered from the order of the History. We finde Elders in Jerusalem first mentioned, Alts 11. and after, Alts 15. but when they were first constituted, we finde not particularly expressed; only we may rationally conceive, that the Apostles in their care for the Churches good, did ordain Elders in that Church very early; for they knew their Commission was not limited to ferusalem, but extended to all Nations, Matth. 28.18. and though Christat his departure gave them a charge to tarry at Jerusalem, Acts 1.4. yet it was but for a time, till they received the Holy Ghost, which was shortly after, Acts 2. after which time they knew not how foon any or all of them might have been called thence to Preach the Gospel to other Nations; and therefore we cannot thinke they would have lesse care of setling Elders there, then Paul upon a like occasion had in the Churches of Lystra, Iconium and Antioch, Alls 14.

2. Let not our Brethren therefore say, The Weight of our Argument lies upon the many Congregations after the dispersion, till they can prove that the Apostles neglected or deferred to ordain Elders untill then.

3. Yet did the weight of the Argument lie where our Brethren would have it, we doubt not but we have so fully proved many Congregations there after the dispersion, as it would fully carry rhe cause.

4. Though the Assembly did not at first so possitively assirm it, it was not because they wanted proof or evidence of the thing, but because they did not judge it necessary: What was spoken to the state of that Church after the dispersion (as before we have said) was rather to remove an Objection, then to make it a further proof of our Proposition

In the rest of this Paragraph our Brethren are somewhat obscure and

perplexed. "They speak of the Presbytery the Proposition intends.

If they know any other kinde of Presbytery over more Congregations then one, belides that which the Propolition intends, and which they conceive lawfull, they shall do well to hold it forth, and to distinguish of Presbyteries, which they deny, and which they grant.

As for that Circle which our Brethren would drive our Argument into, we appeal to all Logick, whether to reason thus, There were many Congregations in fernsalem, and many Elders; and these Congregations were all one Church, and these Elders all of them Elders of that one Church; therefore there were many Congregations under one Presbytery, be to dispute in circulo: If there be any other Circle in what we have sent up to the Honorable Houses, or in any thing that

passed the Vote of the Assembly, let them shew it.

As for that they would fasten upon our Answer to their first Argument, For the further clearing of our selves, we refer them thither, where they shall finde, that Elders have a double relation, one to the single Congregation where they are fixed, another to the several Congregations whereto it is united. Their relation to those thus united, tieth them not to all duties of Elders to all those united Congregations (as our Brethren suppose in their Argument) nor all those Congregations to all duties unto them, but only to those mutual duties for which they were united, as is more at large declared in that Answer. Which of these Relations is primary, is no whit materiall to be insisted upon to our purpose.

To To

To their Reasons against the third Proof of the second Branch, That the Apostles did the ordinary acts of Presbyters, as Presbyters, in the Church of Jerusalem, &c.

Our Brethren labour much to invalidate this Proof, which were they able to do, neither should their cause gaine, nor ours lose much thereby, because (as some of our Brethren have acknowledged) if we prove many Congregations, yet so as they make one Church for Government, it sufficeth: And our Brethren never went about to prove, that in case there were many Congregations in Ierusalem they had severall and Independent Presbyteries, yet we doubt not, but with Gods assistance to make good this proof against all the Reasons our Brethren bring against t, which are as followeth.

"I. First, they grant the Ast of Ministerial power to be the same in Apostles and Elders: but in the extent of that power (which say they is the point in question) the Apostles power over many Congregations cannot be a pattern for Elders, because the Apostles had power over all Churches, and upon that was founded their power over many Congre-

" gations.

"And our Brethren are further pleased to say, That Episcopacy may as strongly argue from Titus his being left alone to Ordain in Crete, that one man a Bishop may Ordain alone over many Congregagations, yea, and more strongly, in regard that the Office of an Evangelist is not so immediately from Christ as this of an Apostle, and so is nearer a succession; or that one Presbyter alone may govern many Congregations, because one Apostle might, as that because the Apostles did govern those many Congregations joyntly, therefore many Presbyters, over severall Congregations may.

1. We accept what our Brethren grant, That the Act of Ministerial Power is the same in Apostles and Elders, the only difference they seeme to infinuate is in the extent: and from thence we infer, That in all affairs transacted by the Apostles properly concerning the Church of ferusalem, they did act as Elders, because in such acts there was no extent of

their power to many, much lesse to all Churches.

2. Whereas they tell us, "That the Apostles power over many Con-"gregations was founded upon their power over all Churches, and so cannot

"be a pattern for the power of Elders over many: We answer,

The Apostles power over many Congregations as one Church, to govern them all as one Church joyntly, and in common, was not founded upon their power over all Churches, but upon the union of those Congregations into one Church, which union layeth a foundation for the Hh power

power of Elders governing many Congregations, and the Apostles practice in governing many Congregations joyntly as one Church, is the pattern and president of that Government, even as our *Brethren* would make the Apostles joynt governing one Congregation, to be the

pattern of many Ministers governing one Congregation.

3. Our Brethren therefore deal not so fairly, while they say Episcopacy may draw a stronger Argument for it selfe from Apostolicall practice then Presbyterie, sure what the Apostles acted singly is not so practicable as what they did joyntly; we cannot but wonder what should move our Brethren to study occasions (as in these Reasonings they seeme sundry times to do) to plead the cause of Episcopacy (which they and we have covenanted to endeavour to the utmost to extirpate) at least to prefer the Bishops plea for their Usurpation, before that which the Reformed Churches bring for their Government, which they and we have covenanted to defend against the common Enemy.

"2. Secondly, (say our Brethren) each of these Apostles, as he had by vertue of his Apostolicall Commission the power of them all; so he had a relation of Ministery unto all those supposed Congregations, and every member thereof for the performance of all sorts of duties, as preaching, admonishing, &c. But in the Presbyteriall Government over many Congregations that have members and officers fixed, the severall Elders are denyed to have the relation of Elders to each Congregation, but make up only an Eldership in common, and therefore the Apostolicall frame is

"not herein our pattern.

We conceive our Brethren here answer themselves, while they say, that, That relation of Ministery which the Apostles had to each of these Congregations, they had by vertue of Apostolicall Commission, for then it prejudiceth us nothing, if ordinary Elders who have no such commission, have no such relation, and the Presbyteriall Government answers the pattern well enough, though it carry not with it those relations which the Apostles had by vertue of Apostolicall commission, which we cleare more sully thus:

1. The Apostles intended here to act so, as to be patterns to others in such things as were Acts of Ordinary Church Government, and to be performed by ordinary Church Officers, which our Brethren them-

selves acknowledge.

2. There was some kind of division of the charge for the better and more orderly, and edifying performance of the duties of preaching, watching, and other administrations, as the very nature and necessity of the thing makes evident.

3. Yet by reason of this division, they acting as ordinary Elders, were

Dissenting Brethren, against the Instance of the Church of Jerusalem. not bound equally to performe all duties to all their Congregations, and every member of them.

4. Notwithstanding, as they were Apostles they had power to preach, and admonish, and performe all sorts of duties to each of these Con-

gregations, as they had in all the Churches in the world.

In the next place our Brethren proceed to give a summary of the Reafons which moved the Assembly to conclude, That the Apostles did the ordinary acts of Presbyters, as Presbyters, in the Church of Jerusalem.

But herein they deale not fairly with us; For 1. fome things urged in the Assembly, of no lesse weight then any by them repeated, are omitted: And 2. those things which in the Assembly were twisted together, as one concluding Argument, are by them untwisted, and taken in peeces, and so made the weaker, and lesse convincing,

The summe of our Argument, as it is exhibited by them, is as followeth, viz. 1. That those acts of Government, performed by them in that Church, were for the substance of them ordinary acts, such as Presbyters performe, and therefore answerably they themselves are in

them to be considered as Presbyters, &c.

To which first peece our Brethren answer nothing; indeed they had granted the Antecedent before, and they thought not fit here to deny the consequence. But 2. that which they first take hold of is, That the Apostles were called Elders, I Pet. 5.1. 2 John I. and therefore might and did act as Elders, in ordinary acts of Church-Gevernment, for a pattern to us in like administrations.

To which they answer, "That the Apostles are called Elders virtually, not "formally, & only because Apostleship contained all Offices in it, so that they "were Elders, but upon the ground that they were Apostles, and therefore "John in that very Epistle where he stiles himselfe an Elder, writes Ca-"nonicall Scripture as an Apostle, which as a formall Elder he could not "have done; and surely those officers which Christ distinguisheth, Ephel.4." the same person is not formally both these, virtually he may.

That the Apostleship did containe in it virtually and eminently all Church-Offices, we grant; and so, that the Apostles were Elders virtually, and possibly that terme, if fully explicated, would hold out as

much as we desire.

"But, say they, they were not Elders formally.

If they mean, they were not Elders really, we deny it; if they mean, they were not Elders only, we grant it; they were fo Elders, as they were still Apostles, and so Apostles, as they were yet Elders; their Eldership did not exclude their Apostleship, nor their Apostleship swallow up their Eldership. But if by formsally they mean, they were not made Elders before or after they were made Apostles, but that being Hh 2 Apostles,

Apostles, they might and did act as Elders (which they disprove not)

that is sufficient for our Argument.

Their reason from the distinction of Offices concludes nothing, for Offices very distinct, may be formally in one and the same person, as, of King, Priest and Prophet in one Christ; Melchisedeck was formally a King and Priest, and David formally a King and Prophet.

Our Brethren in the further prosecution of this Reason of theirs say, "That all which the Apostles did in the Church of Jerusalem, they are said to all as Apostles: Their Preaching is called the Apostles Doltrine, the money was brought and laid at the Apostles feet, the Deacons were brought and set before the Apostles, and they laid their hands on them, yea in that all of Ordination they must needs all as Apostles; for they do not only ordaine the Men, but erest the Office, which none but Apostles could immediately and at first have done, so as the same persons, in the same ast, "must ast partly as Apostles, and partly as Elders; and by what infallible Rule shall we distinguish it?

We Answer, The Scriptures related to, shew that the particulars mentioned were acted by men, Qui erant Apostoli, who were Apostles, but not Qua erant Apostoli exclusive, as they were Apostles exclusively; so as they might not act them under another notion: Sure our Brethren upon further thoughts will not affirme it; for if the Apostles did preach take the trust of the goods of the Church, ordain Officers Qua Apostoli exclusive, will it not follow from hence, that none may do any of these things but Apostles? which we are sure

our Brethren will never say.

As for that Ordination, Acts 6. we doubt not to say, that in it they did act partly as Apostles, partly as Elders, in constituting an Office in the Church which was not before, they did act their Apostolicall authority, but in ordaining into that Office men whom the Church had chosen, they did act as Presbyters; and we doubt not, but that our Brethren in this will concur with us: For if they will not fay that the Apostles did herein act partly as Apostles, and partly as Elders, they must say they acted either only as Elders, or only as Apostles; if only as Elders, thence it will follow that all Elders have power, not onely to ordaine men, but to erect new Offices in the Church; if only as Apostles, then hence is no warrant for any Elders, so much as to ordaine men unto an Office. And certainly it is not so hard for our Brethren to distinguish between these two; for looke by what infallible rule they make some things in the practice of the Apostles to be, not only a patterne for Imitation, but even a proof of an Institution; and yet decline other things practifed by the same Apostles, as things not only by Institution not commanded to us, but not permitted to be Vintimated by us; by the imitated fame

same Rule may they infallibly distinguish between what they acted as Apostles, and what as Elders.

3. The next particular our Brethren insist on, is that Branch of the Argument, where it is said, The Aposites acted joyntly, and in collegio, over

those many Congregations; To which they answer three things:

"I. That they had all fingly the same power, which they exercised joyntly, and they exercised that power together, because it sell out that they were together; and it was sit that none should be excluded; but that they should exercise it joyntly to give a pattern for Eldership is not easy to prove: Their authority of suisdiction did not arise from, nor depend upon the union of all in a body, as in an Eldership and Par"liament it doth: One Apostle might have done that, which all here did; "Yea may it not be said, that because two Apostles ordained Elders Acts 14. as joyned in the same act, and so acted not as Apostles, but Elders,

" that therefore two Elders associated may do the like?

We deny not, but the Apostles acting as Apostles, had power to act singly, what they did joyntly, and yet we say not only as our Brethren, that the Apostles being together, it was sit they should act together, that none might be excluded; but further, that they were bound to act together, because as each of them alone had the power, so they all had the power; and therefore it was necessary they should act together, both for their own mutuall support, as also that their acts might have the more authority in the Church, in reference whereto (in part) they of Antioch may be conceived to have sent to the whole Colledge of Apostles and Elders at ferusalem, when yet Paul and Barnabas, who were with them, by their decisive Sentences, might have ended the Controverse.

"But however its not easie to prove that they exercised their power

" joyntly, to give a pattern to Presbytery.

Surely as easie, as it is to prove, that their taking in the consent of the people, Acts 6. in the choise of Deacons, was to give a pattern for the

suffrage of people in the choise of Officers.

We have proved already, that there were many Congregations in Jerusalem; that these Congregations were one Church; that the Apostles who were Officers governed this Church; and that they governed joyntly our Brethren grant: Is not here a pattern for severall Congregations in a City, or vicinity, to unite into one Church; and for the Officers of those Congregations to governe that Church joyntly in a Colledge of Presbytery?

"But their power of Government did not result from their being injuried together, as the power of a Presbytery doth; as the Parliamentary power which is not the result of Parliament men, but as assembled in Parliament.

"Parliament." We

We answer, Parlimentary Power in actu primo, ariseth from their being chosen Knights and Burgesses, but in actu exercito, it depends upon their being assembled in Parliament, according to the constitutions of the Kingdom in that case; so here the authoritative power of the Apostles in actu primo, did arise from their office, but that power which their office giveth them, must be exercised according to the constitution of Christ; now it was the constitution and ordinance of Christ, that the Apostles when they were together, and when they could, they should exercise their power, not singly but joyntly, as a Church or Eldership, to be a pattern to others, as appears, Mat. 18.17, 18, 19. & therefore the exercise of this power did in some fort depend upon their acting jointly.

"But then two Elders associated may govern, for Paul and Barnabas did
"Ordain, who acted not as Apostles but as Elders, for they acted joyntly."

What ever our Judgements be of this, certainly our Brethren will never deny but two Elders may govern, who say that two Elders may

make a sufficient Presbytery.

2. The second thing they object against the Apostles acting as Elders when together, is, "Because it is hard to suppose that when they "were all together they should all with an inferiour power to what they put forth alone; if Peter had been alone in a new planted Church, there he "must have alted as an Apostle, because alone, and shall all the Apostles "when so youed together in one alt, be conceived to fall lower in their power

"in the formall exercise of it?

We answer, that we do not suppose the Apostles to fall lower in their power when they acted as Elders; when our Brethren say, at Jeru-salem they acted as Elders of a particular Congregation; let them deliver themselves then from the same inconvenience, and they will relieve us: if they did not fall lower in their power by acting as Elders in a particular Congregation, why should they by acting as Elders in a joynt Presbytery? we have said that their Eldership did not exclude their Apostleship, and now adde, nor did their acting as Elders deprive them of Apostolick power, nor of that Apostolick spirit which guided them even in those things wherein they acted as Elders.

3. And this may take off the edge of their third Objection, which is, if they acted as Elders in a Colledge, then they might miscarry as Elders do, and so come under the danger of excommunication, and what power

" mas there on earth to excommunicate an Apostle?

We deny the consequence upon the former ground, and therefore need not answer their demand, what power there was on earth, &c. to which yet if they desire satisfaction we refer them to M. Parkers Tra-Etate de Politia Ecclesiastica lib. 3. cap. 12.

4. The third peece of our Argument which our Brethren fall upon,

is, The Apostles joyning with others in their proceedings, as in the choice of Deacons, Acts 6. which also they used to do in other Churches.

This fay our Brethren doth not prove they acted as Elders.

"I. Because they joyned others with themselves in alls wherein yet they afted as Apostles, as Paul joyned Sylvanus and Timotheus with him, not meerly in his salutation, but in his Epistle to the Thess. so also Acts 15. the Apostles, Elders, yea, and Brethren joyned in a letter to the Churches; But these as Apostles, and therefore so called in distinction from the Elders, and the rest; so in ordaining Timothy, the Presbytery. laid on hands, yet they as a Presbytery, Paul as an Apostle, for the Presiberry had no power to ordain an Evangelist.

We answer, whereever the Apostles joyned others with them in acts that are to be imitated by other Church officers, such a joyning of others with themselves shewes, that therein they acted as Elders; and therefore that instance of Sylvanus and Timotheus is nothing to the purpose, it was a work of quite another nature then those of which we

are now disputing.

Their next instance of Alls 15. may seem to come neerer, to which we shall give a full Answer in its proper place, only for the present (as before to a like Scripture, so here) we say, The Text sheweth the Letter was written by men qui erant Apostoli, who were Apostles, but not simply and exclusively, quâ Apostoli, as Apostles.

And for the Ordination of Timothy, our Brethren must prove, that those two Texts that speak of Pauls laying on of hands, and of the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, speak of one Ordination, and one joynt act of Imposition of hands, and that Timothy was ordained an Evangelist, before they can make any thing of it to their purpose.

"Yet, secondly (say our Brethren) the Apostles, where ever they came, "left the Elders and people to the exercise of that right which belonged to

"them, although they joyned with them.

We are herein fully of our *Brethrens* minde; only we defire it may from hence be observed, That it doth not belong to the people, to ordain either Deacons or Elders, whatever it may do to choose; for the Apostles, who, where ever they came, left to the people what right belonged to them, did no where leave them to ordain. But in the next words our *Brethren* and we possibly may differ.

"Their Apostolick authority (say they) did not lie in doing all alone,

" for then they seldom or never acted as Apostles in the Church.

We say their Apostolick authority did lie, partly in doing all alone; and furely our Brethren will not say, that any ordinary Church Officer might do all alone: how often, or how seldome they acted their Apostolick power, we determine not. "Their instance of Pauls not excommunica-

"ting the incestuous Corinthian alone, we acknowledge: Yet certainly Paul by his Apostolick power, might have excommunicated him alone, as well as he did Hymeneus and Alexander. But what doth this make for them, or against us? "Paul alone excommunicated not (say they) "that Corinthian, and yet as an Apostle, wrote to have it done. What then? Had they said, Paul excommunicated not the Corinthian alone, but joyned with the Church in excommunicating him, and yet excommunicated him as an Apostle, this had come home to the point.

We say with them, that what the Apostles did by Apostolicall power (properly so called) should not be drawne into Example: But we deny that which they affirme, that their Apostolicall power lay in exercising furisdiction over severall Churches: No, it lay in this, that they had power to exercise Jurisdiction over all; which power no Presbytery hath, nor can challenge. And for the Proof now before us, and Scriptures by occasion thereof now under debate, they speake not of the power which the Apostles exercised over many Churches (and so by our Brethrens own Assertion speake not of Apostolicall power) but over one Church consisting of many Congregations; nor doth the Presbytery by warrant of this president lay claime to a Government over many Churches (as our Brethren insinuate) but over one Church.

"But this (say our Brethren for a conclusion) will not help it, that they "exercised their Government in those Congregations, considered as one "Church; for if they could not as Elders, then the correlate to it, namely

. Church, could not be considered as Presbyteriall.

Whether the Apostles in their acts of Government could be considered as Elders, we leave to the wisdome of the Honourable Houses to judge by what hath been spoken. 1. They are called Elders. 2. They were in our Brethrens owne confession, virtually so, we say really and indeed. 3. They acted in Collegio in a joynt body, our Brethren fay it was fit they should so do; nor was this any degradation of the Apostles, or diminution of their power, acting joyntly as Elders, yet they acted as Apostles. 4. They took in the consent of the Church with them, in things wherein the Church had a right of confenting; we might further adde, 5. They acted that power committed to them, Matth. 16. and Matth. 18. And 6. if they acted not as Elders, we can draw nothing of theirs into imitation; which last were insisted upon in the Assembly, but because not replyed to by our Brethren we do but touch upon: but from all these particulars we warrantably conclude, That they acted as Elders in the Church of ferusalem; and argue with our Brethren, from the relate to the correlate. Therefore the Church of Ferusalem was a Presbyteriall Church. To

To their Reasons against the fourth and last Proof of the second Branch; viz. Elders meeting together for acts of Government, proved by Acts 11. ult. Acts 15. 4, 6, 22. Acts 21.17, 18.

Ur Brethren might well have spared all that they have said against this clause in the Ptoposition, Elders meeting together for acts of Government, since they themselves do affert, as much as we'do, that the Elders of the Church of ferusalem did meet together for acts of Government; only they suppose that that Church was no more Congregations then one; So thus they differ not from us concerning the truth of the attribute, but concerning the sense of the subject of this Proposition; The Elders of the Church of ferusalem did meet together for acts of Government; but since they are pleased to make exceptions, let us examine them,

First, the Argument from Alts 11. ult. our Brethren conceive to be this, "There were Elders in Judea that received almes, therefore the El-"ders of Jerusalem did meet together for alls of Government: Which is a marvellous mistake, for our proofe was laid thus: Alts 11. ult. and Alts 21. 17, 18. and the verses following, shall be brought to prove that clause in the former Proposition, Elders meeting together for alts of Government: So that we did not argue from Alts 11. ult. singly, but

joyned with Alts 21.

Next, had we argued from that place alone, our Brethren have excep-

ted nothing which can weaken such a proof. For

Whereas they say, That both the persons and the ast are mistaken, The "persons, because the Elders of Jerusalem are not mentioned, but the Elders of Judea, as by comparing ver. 29, and 30. it appeares: The ast, because receiving of almes is no ast of Government. We answer, the persons and the act both are mistaken by themselves, not by us: For sirt, the Elders of Judea, are not at all mentioned, but only the distressed Brethren of Judea, are not at all mentioned, but only the distressed Brethren of Judea. And secondly, if the Elders of Judea had been mentioned, this had been comprehensive of the Elders of Jerusalem. Thirdly, the messengers of Churches abroad, and particularly of Antioch, were ever directed to the Apostles and Elders of Jerusalem, when they did at all send into Judea; and as Barnabas was sent from Jerusalem to Antioch, Asts 11.22 and the Prophets came from Jerusalem to Antioch, ver. 27. so it is the sense of Interpreters upon Asts 11.30. that Paul and Barnabas were sent from thence to Jerusalem; and it is the more likely, by comparing Rom. 15.31. yea, Fourthly,

Ιi

As for the act, we suppose our Brethren will not deny but there was much more in it then the receiving of almes, namely the ordering and appointing how it should be best improved and disposed of; which being an act of Government, and it being denied by none that the Elders did meet together for this act; It must follow, that Acts 11. ult. doth not a little strengthen that clause in the Proposition, Elders meeting together for acts of Government.

The next place added for proofe of the same clause, is Acts 21. 17,18. and the verses following; to which our Brethren reply thus; "The "occasion of the meeting was Pauls entertainment, a duty of love and res "heet. Secondly, that the acts which passed were none of them Presbyteri-

"all, only they gave advice to Paul for preventing a scandall.

To this we say, First, it is more then our Brethren can prove, that the occasion of this meeting was only to receive Paul, for the Text admitteth (if not favoureth) another sense, ver. 18. Paul Went in With us unto Tames, and all the Elders were present; and how do our Brethren know, that they were assembled upon no other occasion? especially it being faid that Paul went in to James, it may be not knowing till he came, that all the Elders were present. Secondly, if there were no more but the mention of Eiders meeting together, it doth abundantly prove all which we intended to prove from this place, thus, That Scripture which proves a Presbytery in ferusalem, or an association of the Elders in that Church, proves, that the Elders of the Church of ferusalem did meet together for acts of Government: But Acts 21. proves a Presbytery in Jerusalem, or an association of the Elders of that Church; therefore it proves that the Elders did meet together for acts of Government: The Proposition our Erethren will not deny, because a Presbytery cannot do their duty, but must needs neglect the work committed to them. if they do not meet together for acts of Government: Neither can they deny the Assumption, that Alts 21. proves a meeting of Elders in ferusalem, or a Presbytery in ferusalem, as Tossanus calls it; yea themselves take their warrant from that place, for the Presbyteries meeting apart from the Multitude, to consult and prepare matters. And Thirdly, what themselves say in this place, doth not make against us, but for us; for if the Elders of Jerusalem did meet together for a Salutation, did not they much more meet together for acts of Government? So that, fourthly, it is not necessary here to debate whether any Authoria tative act of Government done by these Elders, then and there met together, be mentioned, Alts 21. 17,18. &c. It is enough for us, that this place proves, That the Elders of ferufalem did sometimes meet together for acts of Government. Lastly, neither do these who have most authority, being met together, alwayes and in every thing peremptorily enjovn enjoyn and ordain what they would have done, but oft times consult and advise only, howbeit the advise of Elders is not lax, but binding and restrictive, verf 23. Do therefore that which we say unto thee.

In the next place, our Brethren alledge Reasons against the producing of Alts 13. for the meeting of the Elders of ferusalem for Presbyteriall acts of Government; wherein they fight with a shadow; for we faid not Presbyteriall acts of Government, but acts of Government. "But, say our Brethren, if it were a meeting of Elders for acts of Govern-"ment, then it was a Presbyteriall meeting for asts of Government. This Consequence they could not be ignorant that we deny; yet they have not faid one word for proofe of it, only they go about to prove, 'That " this meeting, A&s 15. was not a Presbyteriall meeting, and that Synodi-"call meetings differ much from Presbyteriall meetings. Which maketh nothing against us, for we have constantly afferted it to be a Synodicall meeting; And if it be asked, To what end then do we adde Alts 15. as a Branch of the proofe of the Proposition for Presbyteriall Government? We answer, 1. It was added to prove that clause in the Proposition, Elders meeting for acts of Government; the meeting together Presbyterially being proved by other Mediums; as for instance, thus, All the severall Congregations in Jerusalem were one Church, Alts 8. 1. and 15.4. And how can many Congregations be one Politicall Ministeriall Church, except only because they are united, and associated under one Presbyteriall Government? And secondly, If we had proved from Alls 15. a Presbyterial meeting for acts of Government, the Proofe had been as strong and valid as this, Here is a Brigade, therefore here is a Regiment; here is an University, therefore here is a Col ledge. A meeting for Synodicall acts of Government, is no weake proof of a meeting for Presbyteriall acts of Government, unlesse we will suppose that they who were carefull to assist other Churches, did neglect their own Churches committed to their peculiar charge, and take no care of governing them; yea Alts 17. 2, 4. doth most certainly prove a Presbyteriall Government in Jerusalem, thus, Where the Apostles and Elders did governe, and many Congregations were by them governed, vet so, that all these Congregations were one Church, there we may certainly conclude there was a Presbyteriall Government: But in ferusalem the Apostles and Elders did governe, and many Congregations were by them governed, yet fo, that all those Congregations were one Church: Therefore we may certainly conclude that there was in ferusalem a Presbyteriall Government; all this is certain from Acts 15. except, that there were many Congregations in ferulalem, for which we refer to the former proofe.

"But, secondly, our Brethren deny their meeting, Acts 15. to have

"been such an ordinary formall Synod, or the acts thereof to have been acts of Government, as they proceeded from those Elders; the jurisdiction of Synods reaching no further then to such Churches as have sent Commissioners thereunto; and to make good what they intend, they bring severall

. Reasons, which they have reduced to four heads or Classes.

It is to be observed, that our Brethren do not simply deny that this was a Synod, or that the Decrees of it had authority; but that it was not such a Synod, nor the decrees of it of such authority; neither do they clearly expresse what they mean to conclude from these four Classes of Reasons. For as to that Debate, Whether it be a formall Synod, or not, our Brethren might have spared it, as not being hujus loci, but belonging to the Votes concerning Synods, not then sent up to your Honours. But however, we shall examine their Reasons, as they have propounded them.

"First, say they, We read but only of two Churches, between whom the matter was transacted, they of Antioch sent to them of Jerusalem, "and that Electively, because they were the Mother-Church, from whom the Word of God came, and from whom those men that troubled them had gone forth, and had pretended to teach what they had received from them: "Neither is their mention made of any Elders sent thither, either from the Churches of Phænice, and amaria, ver. 3, or from the Churches of Judea: yea it is not so much as said that the Elders that were sent from

66 Antioch, Were of the Elders of that Church.

We answer, If a Synod of two Churches, it proves a Synod of more Churches, even of as many as shall combine, and associate Synodically: yea our Brethren themselves acknowledge (some of them) [ Ep. before the Keyes, &c. ] Acts 15, to be a warrant for the meeting of Elders out of many or all Churches, and that it is an Ordinance of Christ. Secondly, if the Church of Jerusalem were sent to Electively, by way of Reference or Arbitration, as our Brethren use to call it, then the Church of Antioch only should have been tyed by that Decree, they only having made the Reference; Besides, those who were sent from the Church of Antioch, ought not to have been members of that meeting (asit is certaine they were ver. 12. and 22.) for they who electively refer the judging of a controversie to others, do not themselves sit as ludges of it. I hirdly, not to stand upon the probability either of the Churches of Syria, and Cilicia, their fending of Commissioners to Jerusalem to make known the condition of their Churches to the Apostles and Elders, and to represent those hurches in that Assembly, whose Decrees did therefore bind them more peculiarly then other Churches; or of the Churches of Phanice and Samaria, their fending of some along with Paul and Barnabas, to testific their consent in a case of so great and publique concernment. cernment, which we may rather think, then that they would fail in such a point of duty, and in the improvement of so precious an opportunity; nor yet to stand upon the utter Improbability of the sending from Antioch Deacons, or some other of the people, rather then Elders; We cannot passe by that Reason given by our Brethren, for sending to Ierusalem only, because from them did those men go forth that troubled the Churches: which is a mistake; for, it is not said, they came out from Ierusalem, but plainly, that they came out from Iudea, ver. 1. and this strengthens us, and weakens them; Those Elders from whom the false Teachers did go forth, were members of the Synod, ver. 24. but the Elders from whom the false Teachers did go forth, were the Elders of Iudea, ver. 1. thererefore the Elders of Iudea were members of the Synod.

We know that they who come from Ierusalem come from Iudea, but our Brethren take it for granted, that they who came from Iudea came from Ierusalem; the words also admit another exposition, that this going forth was not locally, but doctrinally, as we shall shew afterwards.

2. But secondly, to prove that these Letters and Decrees were written and sent only from the Elders of Ierusalem, they alledge divers things, as chap. 16.4. "They are called the Decrees of the Apostles and " Elders in Terusalem, it being the usuall stile of the new Testament "by way of distinction to say, the Church in such a place, the Elders " in such a place. This they say, but they have not produced one instance, where the Elders in such a place, is put for the Elders of such a place; we rather suppose that if the Holy Ghost had meant, Alls 16.4. to speak of the Elders of Ierusalem only, he would have said, the Elders of the Church of or in Ierusalem: as Rev 2.3. The Angell of the Church in Ephesns, the Angell of the Church in Sardis, &c. and we cannot but put our Brethren in minde, that themselves would not acknowledge those who were ware Erles in Isparanip, Alts 2. 5. dwelling in Ierusalem, to be members of that Church; yet here they will needs understand by Tan of en Butepan Tan on Isparaieu, the Elders of that Church only; whereas we need not fur ply fo much as Tan nalorn willow but only surax 301/201, not dwelling at Ierusalem, but met together at Ierusalem, or as it is in our Bibles, which were at Ierusulem.

Secondly, they object ver.4. "Paul and Barnabas are said to be received of the Church, and Apostles, and Elders, namely of serusalem.

True; but that is not to the point, the Synod not being then met; yea it makes against themselves; for if Paul and Barnab.is were sent only to the Elders of Ierusalem, there needed no greater meeting then that mentioned ver.4. whereas there was another meeting in that Chap. ver.6,22,23,25, which was much more fuil and comprehensive.

Ii 3

Thirdly, "the standing Elders of Ierusalem, say they, assumed to them-

"Selves to have written those Decrees, AAs 21.25.

So may the Ministers of London, who are now of this Assembly, when they are declaring by way of Discourse, what the Assembly hath concluded, say, we have concluded; so may the Officers of one Regiment, relating what the Army hath done, say we have done such a thing; nothing more ordinary then such Synedochicall speeches, the part for the whole; and that we must needs understand a Synecdoche in that place is plain, for otherwise, if the standing Elders of Ierusalem had meant, that they alone had written and concluded those Decrees, then they had excluded not only the Elders of other Churches, but Paul also and the rest of the Apostles, from whom these Decrees did proceed, as well as from the Elders of Ierusalem.

Fourthly, they object, ver. 22. the Apostles and Elders with the whole

Church, and ver. 23. the Apostles, Elders and Brethren.

We will not here Debate what is meant by the whole Church and Brethren, which our Brethren know is controverted; but how do they prove, that by the whole Church and Brethren, are meant only those of the Church of Ierusalem, and not the whole multitude of those who were come from feverall Churches? And if by the whole Church we shall understand the Church of Ierusalem only, that proves not, that by the Elders there assembled we must understand the Elders of Ierusalem only; however by the whole Church cannot be meant the whole catus fidelium, who were many more then could meet in one place, specially in a private house, such as the Centurists think this assembly did meet in: but Catus Synodicus, that is the Apostles, Elders, and others assembled from severall Churches, such as Titus, in the judgement of some, and howere, Iudas and Silas, who were not fixed to an Office or Membership in the Church of Jerusalem, but were assistants to the Apostes in severall places, and did the Office of Evangelists; which is plain of Silas, Acts 15. 40. Acts 16. 19. Acts 17.4, 14, 15. Acts 185. and of Iudas, Acts 15.22. 32. so that Iudas and Silas being Members of that meeting, Alts 15.22, it followeth that it was a meeting not only of the Apostles, and Elders of the Church of Ierusalem, nay nor of the Commissioners of Antioch joyned with them, but of others also distinct from both these.

Fifthly, they argue againe from ver. 24. certain that went out from

"us, and to whom we gave no such commandement, &c.

We shall not need to help our selves in answer, 1. By telling them, that those words & new, from us, in which all the strength of their Objection lyeth, are not in fundry copies which Camero owneth [Plant. A. Mont. collat. cum Tilen.] and maketh no lesse use of leaving them out,

in an Answer, then our Brethren do of taking them in, in an Argument, and the taking of them in, or leaving them out, doth not alter the sence of the place. Nor, 2. By faying that the Churches themselves, which were troubled, wrote not that Epistle, but their officers. But reading the Text as our Brethren do, 3. that which we lay weight upon for a fatisfactory Answer, is this, That those false Teachers which went out from Judea, vers. 1. might be faid to have gone out from all the Apostles, Elders, and others, from severall Churches assembled at Jerusalem, and that two wayes, I. by a Synechdoche of the whole, put for an eminent part, which is no derogation at all to the Synod; fure there is a better warrant for this Synechdoche, then to expound that which is said of Indea, vers. I. to be meant of Jerusalem only, as our Bre: bren before did, especially considering that Paul and Barnabas were Members of this Assembly; yet we suppose our Brethren will not say, that those Teachers went out from Paul and Barnabas. 2. Those false Teachers might be faid to have gone forth from all Doctrinally, or by defe-Aion from the Truth, though locally they went out from Judea only. Divers note upon this place, [Camerarius, Lorinus, Gorranus, ] that it may be expounded by I John 2. 19. They went out from us, but Were not of us; which is meant, not of a Locall, but Do Grinall going forth, as Beza there observes-

"Sixtly, they say, if the Elders of all those Churches had been pre"sent, there had been lesse need to have sent chosen men to carry the Letters,
"which the Elders of those Churches returning might have done: And if
they were sent as Messengers from the Synod, why not to all the Churches
as well as to Antioch? yea although Paul and Barnabas delivered the
"Decrees to all the Cicies; yet this was done only accidentally (as it should
"seeme) and not principally intended, nor sent in a Mandatory-way from

"the Synod.

1. It is ordinary for Synods to fend Synodicall Fpiffles and Decrees to particular Churches, not by the Commissioners who came from those Churches, but by chosen men, partly to expresse their great respect to the hurch, and partly to take off all Odium from the Commissioners of those Churches, and for making the generall consent of the Churches the better known; which was in this case necessary, because the authority of Paul and Barnabas had been questioned at Anticch, and their Doctrine excepted against, as not consonant with the judgement of the Apostles at Jerusalem.

Secondly, they fent not to all the Churches, but to Antioch, because the other Churches were not so divided and disturbed, as Antioch, they

apply the plaister where the wound was most dangerous.

Thirdly, Neither need we dispute how those Decrees were delivered

to all the Churches of the Gentiles, whether intentionally or accidentally, as our Brethren canjecture; the reason why they were not sent in the way of Synodicall Decree and Epistle to all the Churches, but only to the Churches of Antioch, Syria and Cilicia, is (as some conceive) because no other Churches of the Gentiles had Commissioners in that Synod; so that no other could be formally bound by their Decrees, other Churches of the Gentiles being bound partly vi materia, partly by the authority of Paul and Barnabas delivering those Decrees unto them, Asts 16. 4.

3. In the third place our Brethren say, "If there were any further "authority in those Decrees, it was from the Apostles, who had power over "all Churches; and although the Elders did consent und approve the De-"crees, yet all the authority put forth over those Churches was Apostolical; "neither can any Assembly of men, wanting Apostolical presence and in"struction, say in such a sence, as they did, it seemed good to the Holy "Ghost, and to us.

It is evident, that the Apostles in this businesse did not act as Apostles with a transcendent and infallible authority; but as Elders, in such a way as maketh that meeting a pattern for ordinary Synods: For,

1. Paul and Barnabas were sent from Antioch to go to Jerusalem, vers. 2. now one of the Reasons used by Divines against Peters Supremacy, is taken from Asts 8.14. Where the Apostles which were at Ierusalem, (that is, the Colledge of Apostles) sent Peter and Iohn to Samaria; now he that is sent, is not greater then he that sends him; and therfore in this, Paul and Barnabas did subject themselves to the Determination of the Church of Antioch, which they could not have done, had they acted as Apostles, and not as Members (for that time) of the Presbytery of Antioch.

2. In that instance of the Synod; (as Cartwright saith rightly against the Rhemists) the Apostles were not acted by an Apostolicoll and infallible Spirit, as when they were writing Scripture; but they did state the Question, and debate it from Scripture in the ordinary way, whereas we never read, that they admitted much, or any disputation, what they should write, or what they should judge of the matter, when they were writing Scripture, as here they did, versize and having by searching the Scriptures, found what was the good and acceptable will of God, thereupon they say (as Doctor Whitaker saith any Assembly upon like assurance of Scripture warrant [Controvers. 3. quest. 6.] may say) It seemed good to the Holy Shost, and to us.

3 Before the decilive suffrage of that meeting, there were deliberative suffrages and discourses, First, by Peter, then by Paul and Barnabas, and after by Iames; and accordingly it is to be observed, that though

Peter

Peter doth cleare the point of Instification by faith, and not by workes of the Law, yet he speakes not to the remedy of the scandall of the weake Iews, which was well supplied by Iames, who offered a way for

preventing and removing that feandall.

4. The Elders all along do act as authoritatively as the Apostles; for as the Elders were sent to, ver. 2. and accordingly assembled, as well as the Apostles, ver. 6. so they did decree and write the Epistle as well as the Apostles, ver. 22,23. and Asts 164. they are called the Decrees of the Apostles and Elders, and Asts 21.25. the Elders say, we have written and concluded: from which places Protestant Writers prove against Papists, that Presbyters as well as Bishops have the power of decisive voycing in Synods, but our Brethren in this particular desert all the Protestant Divines, and joyne with the Popish opinion, which is that the Apostles only had a decisive suffrage in that meeting.

We come to the last head of their exceptions, "They say, there is no "ast of such authority or Government put forth in that meeting, Acts 15." which our Proposition intendeth. For first, here is not summoning nor "censuring of those disturbers of the Church. Again the Subject matter "sent, and the sudgement past about it, is only a Dogmaticall decision of "that Question, whether the Ceremoniall Law should be observed: but "the Froposition intends furisdiction, which is, when Dostrines are delive- "red, Sub poena, under the penalty of Excommunication if not received, one Minister alone hath a Dogmaticall authority to exhort, rebuke, &c."

"but acts of Iurisdiction are not his alone.

First, the Dogmaticall power of the Apostles and Elders met together Presbyterially or Synodically, is another thing then the Dogmaticall power of a single Teacher, and our *Brethren* themselves will acknowledge that the Dogmaticall power of the Presbytery of a single Congregation is a Church-Power, and that which agreeth not to a single Teacher.

Secondly, And they will also acknowledge that the Dogmaticall decision of a controversie of Faith by a Synod, is to be received by the Churches with reverence and obligation, as an Ordinance of

Christ.

Thirdly, There were then three great evills, which were the occasion of that meeting together of the Apostles and Elders. 1. Heresie taught, asserting the necessity of observing the Ceremoniall Law, and that believers could not be saved without it. 2. The scandall of the weake Iewes, and their alienation of minde from the Gentiles, who did neglect those Ceremonies. 3. The Schisme or saves raised by those who troubled the Disciples; and accordingly there was a threefold power or authority put forth in this meeting. 1. The Dogmatick power consuling the He-

Kk refie,

resie, and vindicating the Ttuth. 2. The Diatactick power, making a practicall Canon for avoiding the scandall, and abstaining from such things as gave occasion of it. 3. The Critick power, ver. 24. branding those Teachers with the black mark of Lyars, Subverters of Souls, and troublers of the Church: Now we appeale to our Brethren, whether these be not such acts, as if they were put forth by a parochiall Presbyterie upon any of the members of their own Church, would be by themselves acknowledged to be acts of Ecclesiasticall Government, and authority.

Fourthly, Neither was it necessary to make any mention of Excommunication, it being a cleare case in it self (which we suppose our *Brethren* will not deny) that those Hereticks or Schismaticks, who could be by no other meanes reduced, were not to be suffered, but to be cast out of

the Churches, Revel. 2.2. 14.20.

Secondly, "Whereas those Decrees are called and by pulla to represent the Decrees that were ordained, Acts 16.4. our Brethrensay, though so you is used for an Imperiall Decree; yet but rarely, and more commonly for Dostrine and Opinion, and so it is here used in opposition, to the fulse Dog-

"maes, or Heterodox Theses of the false Teachers, as Col. 2.20.

This is the only place which our Brethren cite for that fense of the word, but doth it not make against themselves? for for make is expounded by the Syriack, Are ye judged; in our English translation, Are ye subject to Ordinances: Erasmus and Bullinger read, Decretis tenemeni: Gualther, Ritibus oneramini: those Ordinances were the Ceremoniall Lawes imposed, Touch not, Tast not, Handle not, vers. 21. therefore Interpreters make that place paralell to Matth. 15.9. In vain they do worship me, teaching for Dostrine the Commandements of men, and we cannot but take notice, that wheresoever so yua is found in the New Testament, it is put for Decrees or Lawes, as Luke 2.1. Asts 17.7. it is put for the Decrees of Casar, and Ephes. 2.15. Collos. 2.14. for the Ceremoniall Lawes of Moses: and so frequently by the Septuagint in the Old Testament, either for Decrees, as Dan. 2.13. and 3. 10.29. and 4.3. and 6.9 and 12.15.26. or for Lawes, as Dan. 6.8.

"As for the other Word new wire, they say, it noteth no more but that "these Doctrinall Theses were the joynt declared sudgement of those who "were met together; therefore when James gives his sudgement, he useth

"the word xen w.

But they might remember the authority which is given *Uni*, is one thing, and the authority which is given *Unitati*, is another thing: If they had given us a place where the word is used of a whole Assembly; and yet noted no Authority nor Jurisdiction, that had been somewhat to purpose: *Iames* might use the word, to significe the Judgement of Discretion.

Discretion, and the whole Assembly might use it, to signifie the Judgement of Authority; in such a signification the compound is used in the Old Testament, as Esth. 2. I. & as the street as what was decreed against her; so also represent and objections is put for a Decree, as Dan. 4. 14.21. so that each word, so yeal a and response holds forth authority, much more both of them put together.

They say, "Those words, To lay upon you no greater burthen, if uny,

" must prove this Iurisdiction.

It is a proofe indeed, but not the only proofe.

"But, say they, these words may be taken passively, that no other bur-

"then be laid on you, as Lodovic. de Dieu hath observed.

As this is contrary to the generall sense of Interpreters, so our Brethren have not given so much as one instance in all the New Testament, where in sused in a passive sence, & they know that ordinarily it signifieth Authoritative Judgement, when used of an Assemblies Judgement, as Iohn 18.31. Alts 24.6. And if we should take it passively in this place, it doth not at all helpe their cause; for when the Text shall be thus translated, It seemed good to the Holy Shost and us, that no greater burthen be laid upon you, then these necessary things: Hence it must follow, that these things are laid upon them as Burdens, and as necessary, and this was done by the synod.

"Next, say they, if the word be taken astively, yet the laying on of a burthen here intended, is but by way of Dostrine, and declaring the command of Christ, as vers. 10. and Matth. 23.4. not by vertue of an Ec-.

" clesiasticall authority.

They cannot prove that the Fharifees laying on of Burthens, Matth. 23.4. was but a Doctrinall declaring, it rather appeares it was an Authoritative commanding, Matth. 15.9. from which place our Protestant Writers dispute against Papists, concerning the binding power and authority of Ecclesiasticall Canons; nor yet can they prove, that the laying on of a roke Acts 15.10. must be understood only Doctrinally, and not rather Authoritatively; or that those who contended in the Synod, for the necessity of observing the Ceremoniall Law, to whom Peter directs that part of his speech, did not endeavour, in their debates, to carry the Judgement of all the Elders that way, to lay on such a yoke, by their Decree, upon the neck of the Disciples; how ever that laying on of the Burthen, and preferibing some things at that time necessary for the avoiding of scandall, vers. 28 is taken as well by Protestant as Popish Writers, who have disputed for the Binding authority of Ecclesiasticall Canons, for a foundation thereof, with this difference, That Papilts will have their binding power to arise from the will and authority of the Church : and these Protestants hold that they bind only per

& proprer verbum Dei, only so farre forth as they are sounded upon, and warranted by the Word of God, as here the Decree of the Apostles and Elders bindeth; and is therefore called the laying on of a burthen; yet so, that they lay on no other burthen, but what was the will of Christ, and what the Law of Love for removing scandalls, did at that time make necessary to be imposed.

That which our Brethren adde, that the Apostles and Elders did not proceed to censure these false Teachers, hath been answered before; they did censure them in some degree, even cum nota infamie; and twas time enough to proceed to Excommunication, when they should be

found incorrigibly pertinacious.

Hereas in the close of the proofe of the Proposition, for many Congregations to be under one Presbyteriall Government, it is asserted, That whether these Congregations be fixed or not fixed, its all one; as to the truth of the Proposition, our Bre-

thren offer this reason against it.

"Every Congregation having Elders fixed unto it, is a Church, for the "relation of Church and Elders is mutuall, Acts 14. And fixed Elders "have a special relation to that Church whereof they are Elders, so as they are not related to other Congregations; but if Congregations have no fixed Officers, they are not Churches according to the principles of Presubsterial Government; now it makes a great difference, say they, as to the truth of the Proposition, whether many Churches may be under the government of one, or whether many Congregations, which are not Churches, may be under the government of one: and that no pattern can be shewed for many Churches being under the power of one, nay

"Where any one Church was under the power of another.

We answer, 1. That a Congregation having fixed Elders, is a Church, and hath power of government in such things as concerne it selse only. if they be able, We acknowledge. 2. That Congregations having Officers, though not fixed, are not Churches, we never afferted. 3. We are not solicitous of names, if we may agree of the thing. 4. Nor did we ever hold, that divers Churches may be under the power of one Church; which is a Prelaticall not a Presbyteriall principle: it is far from our thoughts to put any one Church, though the smallest, under the power and government of another hurch, though the greatest; the power of a Presbytery over particular Churches being not extrinsecall, but intrinsecall to them, and the Presbyteriall or Classicall Church, not another (as the Cathedrall was) but that whole whereof the particular Churches are the constituent parts. 5. And whereas our Brethren say, that Elders fixed to a Congregation, have a speciall relation to that

Dissenting Brechren, against the Instance of the Church of Jerusalem.

Congregation, so as they are not related to other Congregations. If by so as, they meane Comparative more then to others, or in a more speciall and peculiar manner and measure then to others, we grant it: but if by so as, they meane Exclusive, so related to that Congregation, as they have or can have no relation to any other, we have abundantly shewed before how false that is.

"As for their discourse of supposing the Elders to be fixed in Ferusalem, that then the Apostles must be these fixed Elders, which would be "(say they) a great debasing of the Apostles, to make them but as so ma-

"ny Paris Ministers.

We answer, I. It follows not that if they had fixed Elders, that the Apostles must be fixed Elders, there were many other Elders besides the Apostles at Jerusalem; our Brethren grant that there were other Elders after the dispersion, and surely when they had them, the Church had need of them: and they thinke the Church was not then so numerous as it was before the dispersion. Secondly, Suppose the Apostles had been pleased to divide themselves to the severall Congregations, what debasing of them were there in this more then in our Brethrens own way? which opinion will seeme to debase them more, They who would argue, that ten or twelve Apostles divided themselves to do the ordinary worke of Elders in eight, ten or twelve parishes? or they who would thus fixe ten or twelve of them to be as the ordinary Ministers of one parish only?

As to all the test of their discourse upon this point, of the severall Inconveniences which (in their Judgement) will follow, upon the preparing only of worke in the lesser Presbyteries for the greater, and the like, which tends only to disparage the Presbyterial government; Our Brethren touch not us, nor other reformed Churches, so far as we know; We have not yet in our Assembly set forth what all the things are which belong to the parochiall Presbytery, and what to the Classicall, much lesse have we presented any thing concerning them to this Honourable House; when we take these things into debate, we shall willingly heare and weigh our Brethrens Advice and Judgement: And if we offer up any thing in them, as our Humble Advice to the Honourable Houses, which in their judgement shall not prove agreeable to the Word of God, it will then be time enough for our Brethren to give their Arguments against it.

In the last Reason of our Brethren, we observe, That in the stating of the Question, they limit the Proposition only to such Congregations as have fixed Officers, of which, contracting the sense of the Proposition, we have spoken before.

But to follow them in their own steps, We do next observe, that they distinguish between the Presbyterie of a Congregation, and the Congregation, taking them in peeces, which they ought to have considered as unum Complexum, and this to make the fairer way to their Medium of power over power, which (before they come to their argument) they would render the more odious, by comparing it to the Episcopall Assertion, that one Presbyter may be over another. Which Comparison, We conceive neither true nor pertinent.

1. Not True; for the Bishops ascribed their superioritie to an higher degree, or order, Jure divino, distinct from that of a Presbyter: making themselves successors to the Apostles, and Presbyters to the 70. Disciples, and accordingly they had a new Ordination, or solemn

Confectation by impositions of hands.

2. Not pertinent; for I. In a Presbyterie, All things are done Communi Confilio, Whereas the Bishops did all by a personal Jurisdiction, and so his power was exclusive of the power of all other Presbyters. 2. In a Presbyterie, All who judge, are liable to be themselves judged in the same Presbyterie: Whereas the Bishops did judge only, but were not judged by their Brethren. 3. The Bishops power was altogether Extrinsicall to those Congregations which were under it: But the Presbyterie is an Aggregate made up out of their mutual Associations into One.

To that of Powers specifically distinct from each other: VVe acknowledge the Power of the Classes to be more then Numerically distinct from that of particular Congregations: yet such a Power as is the Aggregation or Coalescencie of these severall particular powers into one; and so is not altogether another for Kinde, but only more extensive.

These things being observed upon the forme of stating the Question:

VVe proceed to Examine the Reason produced.

They lay the ground of their Argument thus, "Where the Scripture "holds forth distinct sorts in any kinde, there will be found either distinct "and proper names and Titles, or at least some Adjunct of disserence added to that which is Common or Generall, As I Coil 2. Where Apostles, "Prophets, Teachers, have not only particular Names and Titles, but speciall notes of distinction: First Apostles, secondly Prophets; and Gen. "I. Where no distinction in names is given, The Sun Moon, and Stars, are all called Lights; yet there are Termes of disserence added, Greater and "Lesser."

To which We fay, That it is True, something there must be either in the Text, or Context, or Collated with other places, which may give distinction to things distinct. But then we Answer, That we looked for such Instances as might not only give marks of distinction of things distinct.

distinct, But might give Notes of distinct superioritie of one thing or person over another, which the scope of the Text, 1 Cor. 12. doth tend nothing towards. For though the Apostles were superior to All, yet our Brethren will finde it not so easie to demonstrate the superioritie of Prophets, Teachers, &c. to those mentioned after them. And for that other Instance of the Luminaries, Gen. 1. They are not so great, as that we can see by them any Reason of the consequence, that if Luminaries

be so distinguished, then Presbyteries must be so too.

Secondly, it is not proved that all things that are distinct, agreeable unto, or warrantable by the Scripture, should have distinct Names, Titles, Adjuncts of difference therein set down. Parity of Reason from Scripture grounds is sufficient to give distinction. For we do not after such a formall and expresse mention of the Subordination of Presbyteries and Synods as our Brethren require, because they do not Competere to a Church as it is a Church, but only to the well being of it, in such or such times, places and conditions; for sometimes particular Congretions may want a competent number of Officers, and of men sit for Government, and so cannot have a particular Presbyterie: And sometimes, as in times of persecution, severall Churches may be so dispersed, or may otherwise live at such distance from one another, as that they may be disabled to Associate into a Classicall Presbyterie.

This ground being laid by our Brethren, They thus inforce it, "There is no distinction of Presbyteries by any Name or Title; For in the New Testament the word resolution is but in three places, whereof there is but one which holds out the Government in hand, and in that place we have the naked word only, without the addition of any such expression, Greater, Lesser, Superior, Inserior, or any kind of adjunct that can possibly put a

"thought into us of more Presbyteries then one.

To this we answer, 1. How can it be proved, that by *Presbyterie* in that one place is meant the Presbyterie of a particular Congregation? And if that cannot be proved, how then can the Presbyterie of a particular Congregation be proved?

2. We do not by that word in that one place used, go about to prove distinct sorts of Presbyteries, but we say distinct Presbyteries may be called by that generall name, as every distinct species of Animal, may

be called Animal.

3. As the word metalipion fignifying a Court amongst the Iems, was in Scripture Language the same with metalicies in Consessus, or in Synedrio, as is most manifest; So the same word in the Christian Church, is no other then Presbyteri in consessus, and then we have it above once in the New Testament, as to the Government in hand.

4. The severall Indicatories amongst the Iews, which were as much.

Selden.

and more distinguished then our Presbyteries, had one and the same name, as Gnedah, Cahal, Zekenim, Shophtim, promiscuously given to them all, as the learned have observed [Bertram de Polit. Indaic.c.6.9] and the like may be affirmed of surangle, decanola, and other like. So Synedrium is a common name unto different Courts subordinate to each other. And it is further observed by the Learned, that the Iems had the great Sanedrim, and two others besides that in Ienssalem, and every great City twenty three Elders, and every of these Courts is called Hagnedah.

5. Our Brethren know, that the thing was in the Church before the Apostle made mention of it by this name; for he did not in this place institute a Presbytery: And if he had not here called it so, and the word could no where have been found, yet the thing it self was and would have been in being, as our two distinct Sacraments are, though that name

be not there found.

6. Our Brethren do acknowledge, That the Elders of divers Congregations met together to determine, or Dogmatically declare, matters of faith are the Ordinance of Christ: And yet our Brethren do not any where read God hath set in his Church, First, Presbyteries, then Synods. VVe see no Reason, why a Court of Iudicatorie, might not as well be without a Scripture name, as an Ordinance of Christ is by their own confession.

And therefore we conclude this Nominall medium with our Brethren thus; That as in Scotland and France, and in the Episcopall Republike, there are particular distinct names for the distinct forts or kinds of Administration in their Ordinances for Government; So shall we also use distinct names for them, as well as they; Only we conceive, the Episcopall Republike need not have been named with Scotland and the French, but that they were pleased to serve us with variety.

Our Brethren say, "That as the Scriptures hold forth nothing in any "name or title to distinguish, No more can we therein discover any sorts of "Government different in nature; for do you reade (say they) any where, "God hath set in his Church, First Presbyteries, secondly Classes, then

" Consistories, &c?

To this we answer, 1. That this is but Recurring to disprove difference in nature, because there is no difference in name, and so is all one Medium with the former.

2. They feem to allude to that place, I Cor. 12 first, Apostles, secondly, Prophets, which is not meant of superioritie in Government, nor is the Church spoken of there, any other then the Church Generall, and not in one Kingdom or Nation.

3. It is not necessary, that every Aggregation of Presbyters for Go-

Dissenting Brethren, against the Instance of the Church of Jerusalem. vernment of the Church should have distinct names set down in Scripture: What name in Scripture have those Presbyters that meet dogmatically to determine (ases and Points of Faith? yet they have power, and are the Ordinances of Christ, say they. Scripture sets not things down as Arts do, by Artificiall definitions or distributions; there are no Logicall or Systematicall methods. It sayes not, Faith is dogmaticall and justify.

felves have a being in Scripture.

Now to the particulars of this Medium, It is first said. They have the same materials, and therefore are not in that respect different. This militates as well against Courts Civill, where the members are the same, as against Ecclesiasticall; And we Answer them by their own words.

ing, The Church Generall and particular, &c. and yet the things them-

Although this superior Presbyterie be made up of Presbyters but as Commissioners from the congregational or parochial Presbyteries, yet that hinders not at all, but that they may be Offices distinct. And to the Illustration they give there, we adde, That the Officers of severall Regiments, sitting in a Counsell of Warre; The Heads of Colledges sitting in Consistory; the Aldermen of Wards sitting in Councel, are materially the same; yet the Courts thus made up, are not the same in power with that which these persons have in their particular places of Command.

2 We further answer, that the matter of a particular Presbyterie is, Presbyteries of one Congregation alone, respectively, to that alone: But the matter of a Classicall Presbyterie, are the the Presbyters of severall Congregations respectively unto severall Congregations: Even as the material of a Nationall Synod is not simple Commissioners, but

Commissioners sent from all the Churches of a Nation.

3. Where it is said, That Presbyteration alone doth sufficiently qualifie a gifted person to be the matter of any Presbyterie: VVe answer, That this is not true, without distinguishing of materia Remota, which makes a man only capable of such a Relation; and materia Proxima, whereby a man is actually in such, or such a relation; for unto this, besides Presbyteration, there is required a special Call respectively to those Presbyteries, wherein a man acteth as a Presbyter.

4 Whereas they say, "That a greater number of Presbyters in the one Pref"byterie alters not the State in respect of the matter, We grant it; that it
makes as much against distinct of Civil Judicatures as of Ecclesiastical!.

2. For the Formale, the uniting of these persons into a Consessus or Catus, They say, That this is the same, because a Paster joyned to a particular Congregation is Eo nomine, a member of the Classis to which that Congregation belongs. To this we answer, That union of persons into a Consessus, is but Forma Generica to all Presbyteries or Courts, made up by aggregation of more members, and so it gives no special difference between Presbyterie and Presbyterie. VVe cannot but wonder at such

1.1

a consequence, That if divers Courts do agree in this genericall form of Union and Coalition, therefore they are not distinct in form; for there is a speciall form or reason of their Union, which diversifies them; for the Pastor is united unto other ruling Officers in a single Congregation respectively to that Congregation alone: And he is united to other Pastors and Officers of divers Congregations by Association respectively to all these Congregations; which respects are formerly distinct from one another.

And for that the Brethren say, The Presbyters of a Parochiall Presbyrerie, are as neerly united or more, as in the choise and call of the same Congregation, and in the work of the Ministry. That rather argues the union
to be distinct, and the Presbyteries consequently to be distinct. As the
Master of a Colledge hath a neerer Relation to it in the call of the
Colledge, work of Governing, admitting Schollers, disposing of Revenues, &c. And yet being met in a Consessus of heads, for common
Government over the whole University, doth concur to the making up
of a distinct Court from that in the Colledge: So is it here. The special
Reason of Union of the same person with both making the distinction.

And whereas it is said, That a Presbyter by having Pastorall charge in such division, is Eo nomine member of such a Classis; granting it to be so, that would nothing hinder the Classicall Presbyterie to be distinct from a Parochiall, no more then a Master of a Colledge being Eo nomine, a member of the Consistory doth prove, that the Government of the Colledge and of the University are not distinct; or that every particular Judge of the Kings Bench, common Pleas, and Exchequer, being Eo nomine of power to argue and judge cases, as it were in Collegio, in the Chequer Chamber, would prove that the Judgement in the Chequer Chamber, and that in any of the other Courts were not distinct or different.

So then, to the ultimate form and constitution of a politicall body, there is more requisite then the common uniting of the Members thereof, in Consession; for though the persons should be the same, and the manner of union the same, yet if those persons so united have in one capacity some ends and objects, and in another others, diversity of these will diversifie their meetings, even as different ends and objects do make the same person being united to the same Congregation to be a Pastor in one sence for works of Ministry; and a Ruler in another for works of Government: and a Member in a third, for Communion in worship, and yet Ministry, Jurisdiction, and Membership in the same person are things specifically distinct, though he have both the one and the other by vertue of his union unto that particular Congregation. And that such diversity is sufficient to make a formall difference in matters politicall, wherein specificall diversity may arise from such Reasons

-as in naturall things do not vary the species, our Brethren have informed

us in this paper of theirs.

Now Classicall Presbyteries have different objects namely things of common concernment, and different Ends, as will appeare in the Answer to the next Branch: And this is therefore sufficient formally to difference them from other Presbyteries.

3. Nor, say the Brethren, do we finde any thing in Scriptures making

"them as from different Imployments and Functions to differ.

1. We affirme, and so it is in the Proportion, "The one is superiour, "the other inferiour: But how can you say, the Scriptures have made this dif-"ference, when there is not a word spoken that way in any place? I he sence of their Argument lies thus, If we do not find any thing in Scripture, how can you say it? To which we answer, We can say it, though they do not find it; As they can say, That particular Congregations are independent on any Church-Power superior to them, though we do not find that there is a word spoken this way in any place of Scripture. And as to the Instances alledged out of some Presbyteriall writers themselves, whereby they feeme utterly to take away such difference of superiour and inferiour Presbyteries; because in one place you shall read, The Classis can do nothing, Renitente Ecclesia, but it is nul and invalid, Assertion of Discipline: And in another, the Congregation, though but Minima Ecclefiola, may Reform, that is, suspend, excommunicate, &c. Renitentibus Corre-Chondentiis, Voetius in his Theses, & desperata causa papatus; and that according to these expressions, it is hard to be said, which of these

Presbyteries hath the greater or superior power.

We Answer, 1. That the Renitencie of such as are of the Quorum, and have power of a Negative voice to the rest in any Confessus, doth indeed Null and make voide the Act of the rest: But the Renitencie of them that are not necessarily concurrent to passe an Act of power, is no derogation to the power it felfe, but may give occasion to the govermours in prudence to forbeare the execution of such Act or Sentence: As the Councell of Warre should in wisdome suspend the execution of any Order which may endanger mutiny in the Army: But such Renitencie of people to their governours doth not Null the power; for then they may at pleasure by Renitencie to whatsoever they dislike, Null the power that is over them. And upon this ground, we affirme that the measure or degree of power is not to be estimated by Renitency, or Non-Renitencie of them that are subject to it: For the Renitencie of subjects to a power over them, is either Renitencie of contradiction to that power, or of Appeale from it to an higher, and neither fort Nulls the power; so that the Case alledged by our Brethren is justly thus: The Court of warshould not in wisdome ercise an et of power unto which the Officers and Souldiers of a Regiment are Renitent: But the Offi-

L12

cers and Regiment may reforme themselves, though the Councell of Warre be Renitent: Therefore it is hard to say, whether the Councell of Warre or that Regiment have the greater power. What ever they

shall Answer to this Instance, will Answer theirs.

2. The Authors which they Cite are cleare. The Affertion doth affert, That the Classis should not proceed unto Excommunication, Renitente Ecclesia; But doth not say that such Renitencie anuls the power: and gives the reason, because such Excommunication would want its due effect, because the Renitent Congregation would not cast out a person out of their Communion, which the Classis had discerned to be cast out. And as for Voetins, he doth plainly affert power in a Classis to receive Appeales from a particular Congregation, and to judge of them. The words which our Brethren point us unto, Thef. 5. 8.9. are thefe, Cef-Santibus, aut male rem agentibus Correspondentiis Classicis aut Synodicis, in casu necessitatis (que ordinariam legem sepe non sert) Licet Ecclesis potestatem suam resumere, & recte usurpare, si non cum correspondentià cum aliis completà, saltem incompletà, nunquam enim causà Dei deserenda est. Imo quidni etiam uni Ecclesiola vel minima liceat sua suorumá, saluti consulere, & omnibus correspondentiis renitentibus eam praferre? Cum his teneat illud; charitas & Reformatio incipit à seipso If there be any thing here, which may make it hard to be faid, which of these Presbyteries have the greater or superior power, let them shew it that can, and will make the reverend Author contradictory to himselfe, and to the Title of his Booke, De unione Ecclesiarum, earumg, Regimine in Classibus & Synodis. Surely he giveth no more here to a Congregation, then he doth elsewhere to a particular member in a particular Congregation, Self. 3. and yet it is easie to affirme. That a particular Congregation hath more power then any Member of it.

"2. Our Brethren proceed in their Argument thus, "The worke of a Presbyterie is to ordaine, excommunicate, suspend, admit members, appoint times for worship, and the like. The Classicall reserve Ordination and Excommunication to themselves; but the other are left to the Puro-chial Presbyterie Thus some Presbyterians divid: the work others possibly otherwise. But how can we affirme any such designement from the Scriptures, if you have not two sorts, either in name, or nature to be found there? And none of these Acts but may be done by that one; which doubtlesse they may: seeing Ordination seemeth to be specified in the Text, If they may: seeing Ordination seemeth to be specified in the Text, If they may: seeing Ordination seemeth to be specified in the Text, If exhort, in another to comfort, in another to visite the sicke. This will not warrant distinct sorts of Pastours, for there being but one sort spoken of in Scriptures, we must interpret all these severall Administrations to belong unto that one.

To this we answer,

1. That the Argument is Circular, for they prove there are not two forts of Presbyteries, because not different imployments belonging to them: And now they prove, that there are not different imployments, because we have not two forts of Presbyteries in name and nature, to be found in Scripture, to whom these imployments should belong.

2. There is no fuch division of the worke of Presbyteries yet deter-

mined, nor in some part yet debated in this Assembly.

3. Admitting that all these acts here mentioned, ought to be done in a Parochiall Presbyterie, Quoad speciem Actus, yet it followes not, but that there may be a superiour Presbyterie; for if there be a Presbyterie, which hath power to Order, Correct, or Direct this power of a particular Presbyterie, Then, by the confession of our Brethren, there is a distinct Presbyterie. As suppose an Inferiour Court have power to impose Fines, Imprison, put to death: The Court to which appeale is made, can do no more; and yet it is Superiour, because it hath power

to Correct, Order, and Direct those acts of the Inferiour.

4. Our Brethrens Argument doth proceed upon an insufficient Enumeration of imployments, for that there are many imployments, proper to another fort of Presbyterie, distinct from that which is Parochial, we shew by a more full Enumeration of particulars, as 1. In matters of common concernment to more Churches then one. 2. In case of an Incompetent Presbyterie Parochiall. 3. In case of Appellation and presumed-male-administration. 4. In case of divisions arising in particular Churches and Presbyteries. 5. In case of differences betweene Neighbour Churches. 6. In case of Sects and Heresies spreading abroad, and endangering the peace of the (hurch, and Truth of God. 7. In case of obstinacy, when the Major part of a Congregation erring, refuse to put the differences amongst them to Reference or Arbitration, 8. In rale of Examination of a Ministers Learning in Tongues, Arts, Theologie, and other things requisite to make him a fit Pastour or Teacher for such a particular Congregation, according to the Rules of Ordination already established. 9. In case the people, or any of them, reject or flieght the admonition or censures of their Pastour and Officers. 10. In case the Pastour be like some Diotrephes, tyrannicall and vexatious to the people, and they not able to helpe themselves, or do subtilly deliver and ipread amongst them erroneous Doarin. 11. When the Prefbyterie and people are divided into equall, or almost equall parts. 12. When hard and difficult cases are to be dicided. 13. When some powerfull adversaries or persecutors, are to be resisted Spirituali armaturâ. 14. To prevent partiality or neglect of censures towards some offenders, such as was in Corinth: towards the incestuous person. 15. In case of the Excommunication or Deposition of a Pastor.

In these cases, saith Voetins, Non puto aliquem negaturum quin Salubris sit Antoritas multarum Ecclesiarum, uno animo, unis Consiliis conjunctarum; quid ni necessaria.

5. When it is said, That Ordination seemes to be done by a particular

Presbyterie, and therefore all other things may be done there too.

1. For the Antecedent, it is gratis dictum, and being granted, the consequence is denied: Neither doth the degree of greater or lesser make any proofe of it; for to preach the word, and administer Sacraments, are as great works, as to Excommunicate, yet it doth not follow, because a Minister may do those alone, therefore he may do this alone too.

And besides, It is also gratis distum, to say that Ordination is the greatest worke belonging to Presbyterie; especially for our Brethren to say so: who sometimes thinke it not all requisite, and when it is, make it only a solemne admitting him into his place.

Surely our Brethren looke upon the delivering of a man unto Satan

as a worke of an higher nature.

As for that which our Brethren say: "It was not found so easie in this "Assembly to finde two sorts of Elders, Teaching and Ruling; though the "Scripture in some places speake so plaine of them, as if of purpose to distinguish them. And therefore it must need be more difficult to finde out "two sorts of Presbyteries.

We answer,

1. That it is no right way of Argumentation to dispute from the difficulty of finding a thing to the denying of it. Many points in Divi-

nity are of difficult discovery, and yet not to be denied.

2. As it seemes to have beene easie and cleare in the apprehensions of our *Brethren*; That there are severall sorts of Presbyters, though they say it was a difficulty to the Assembly, so they may be pleased to allow the same clearenesse of apprehension to the Assembly in the point of Presbyteries, though it seeme difficult to themselves.

3. If the Assembly found it hard to finde out that which is plaine in Scripture, Then the paines of the Assembly in discussing and searching the Scriptures, argues not Inevidence of the thing it selfe, but their care to finde a good Foundation of that advice they should give to the Honourable Houses, and their care to satisfie if it were possible their

dissenting Brethren.

4. The consequence which they inferre is denied, That it must be more difficult to finde out two forts of Presbyteries; For admitting there were but one fort of Presbyters, yet it is easie to compound of them two forts of Presbyteries, as easie as it is of Justices of the Peace, Heads of Colledges, Aldermen, Burgesses, to forme distinct meetings in regard

of

of power, and the administration thereof, which is confessed by the Brethren in their instances of Burgesses of Cities and Townes Corpo-

rate, sent up unto, and sitting in Parliament.

And whereas they say, That it is generally granted by Presbyterians themselves that for above sifty yeares after Christ and in the Apostles times, there was but one kinde of Presbyterie: We desire our Brethren to tell us, what fort of Presbyterie that was, Parochiall or Classicall, as we now call them. If Parochiall, who are these Presbyterians that so grant? If Classicall (which they know those Presbyterians meane, who from undoubted antiquity averre, that the Church was governed, Communi Consilio Presbyterorum) then it helps them not at all, for if the Brethren grant parochiall, and the Presbyterians grant classicall, then there are two distinct sorts by grant on this part, and on that. However the Rules and Reasons which the Presbyterians go upon, were as valid in these former times as now.

To the Inference made from the wisdome of States to the wisdome of Christ, in clearely bounding out the Judicatories of his Church, we shall not go one syllable lesse in our attributions to Jesus Christ then our Brethren. But though unwilling to make such comparison of things, which are of no degree of comparison, we answer to that which is Argumentative in this Rhetorique; If the light of nature have directed all States to appoint superior Courts for relieving of men in case of Appeales from the miscarriages of inferior: we apprehend it no lesse wisdome in Christ, to appoint or warrant such authority in his Church, as may relieve wrongs through mistakings or miscarriages of inferior Presbyteries; For otherwise the Ecclesialicall Republick were in worse case then the Civill, which confessedly doth afford reliefe of wrongs about inferior Claimes.

2. What is it that the Brethren would assume? Is it that Christ hath set such bounds of Church Judicatures for reliefe of wronged persons? Then they grant the Question. Or hath he set no such? Then, how do they vindicate his wisdome!

And whereas it is said, that Controversies and classings about these high and publike Interests, are no other in the issue, then the dividing of a Kingdome Within it selfe (thereby haply intimating some formidablenesse of the Government to the Civil State:) That this Observation of theirs is true, we have too sad experience. But that a Presbyterie over a Presbyterie doth thus divide a Kingdome within it selfe, the experience of all the Reformed Churches where this Government hath obtained, doth plainely witnesse the contrary:

3. We shall not easily grant what our Brethren infinuate, That matters of Practise and Duty, should rather have Obscurity in the Rule, then Authority Authority and Jurisdiction; since the former being matters of Faith, VVorship and Obedience, do more immediately relate unto Salvation it selfe; the other, though it be subservient thereunto, yet in an

inferior and remoter degree.

Neither are we inforced out of one word, but once used, to raise up so many Thrones (as they call them) or Formes of Government; For the Forme of Government is but One; and for the warrantablenesse thereof, we have shewed it out of other places of Scripture, not so much as mentioning this to prove our Proposition, which our Brethren so

much insist upon.

And lastly, we cannot but wonder, That all the Churches of Christ, untill this present Age, should never before have discovered this frame of Government, by our *Brethren* contended for, as so cleare and evident; Especially considering, that the Nature of man is very inclinable, to search out diligently, and easily to assert such wayes of Liberty, whereby they may be Independent upon superiour Authority and Jurisdiction over them.

Cornelius Burges, Prolocutor pro tempore.

John White, Assessor.

Henry Robroughe, Scriba.

Adoniram Byfield, Scriba.

## FINIS.



REASONS against, and ANSWERS to the Proofes from, the Instance of the Church of Ephesus, Alledged by the Reverend Assembly, to prove,

That The Scripture holds forth, That many Congregations may be under one Presbyteriall Government.

THE ARGUMENT of the Reverend Assembly from the Church of Ephesns, is laid downe in these three Propositions:

"First, The multitude of Beleevers did make more Congregations than

e one in Ephesus.

"Secondly, There were many Elders over those many Congregations, as

" over one flock.

"Thirdly, Those severall Congregations were one Church, and under one Presbyteriall Government.

The Proo of Es brought by the Reverend Assembly to prove the first Proposition, viz. That the multitude of Beleevers did make more Congregations then one, in Ephesus, are these:

" Act. 20. 31. Where there is mention made of Pauls continuance at E-

" phesus preaching for the space of three years.

"Act. 19.18, 19, 20. Where the special effect of the word is mentioned, "viz. Many that believed came and confessed their deeds, many also of them which ased curious arts, brought their books together, and burned them be"fore all men, and they counted the price of them, and they found it to be sifty
"thousand pieces of silver, so mightily grow the word of God, and prevailed.
"Act. 19.10, 17. where mention is made of Jews and Greeks.

" I Cor. 16.8,9. where a reason is given of Pauls stay at Ephesus un" till Pentecost, viz. because a great and effectual doore was opened.

"I Cor. 16.19. where there is mention of a particular Church in the "house of Aquila and Priscilla, who were then at Ephesus, as appeares Act. 18.19. 24.26.

M m

## To these Proofes, the ANSWERIS,

First, as for such of them which are brought to prove the number of Beleevers in Ephesus, the consequence is denyed, Because that not-withstanding what is said of the Apostles being three years at Ephesus, and a great and effectuall doore was opened, and so mightily grew the word of God, and prevailed, &c. it follows not that the Converts in Ephesus were so many as could not meet in one place. For

First, Suppose it be granted there were two or three thousand (though there is no sufficient ground to say there were neere so many) yet they all might meet in one place; and yet this were enough to shew that there was a large and effectuall doore opened to the Apostle, and

a comfortable fruit of his so long stay and preaching there.

Secondly, because this efficacy of the word preached by Paul, hath reference not only to Ephesus, but also to all Asia, Asts 19.26. not Only in Ephesus, but throughout All Asia; this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people. And where he saith, Ass 20.30. for the space of three years he ceased not to warne every one night and day with nears: The words are not to be restrained to his being at Ephesus; but to be understood of his being in Asia, as appears by Verse 18. Te know from the first day that I came INTO Asia, after what manner I have been with you at all SEASONS, serving the Lord with all humility of minde, and with many teares.

Secondly, as for the price of the bookes of the converts.

The Answer is, That when there was no printing, a few mens books, yea, a few books of so curious and gainfull art; might well be worth that mony. For, that fifty thousand pieces of silver, Calvin upon the place, computes to be but nine thousand pound French, which is fix hundred seventy five pound sterling, or there abouts, at eighteen pence the frank. Beza reckons it lesse, viz. eight thousand seven hundred pound french: and our own Country-man Breremood in his first Chap. de nummis, interpreting this very place; accounts every application at 7.d. ob. according to which rate, the summe amounts to about 1406. I. sterling. Some one mans study now of common books, though not Manuscripts, as they were, is worth as much; and how can this argue such a multitude of beleevers, or severall Congregations, as could not meet in one place, we cannot see.

Thirdly, as for the Church in Aquilas house which is supposed by the Reve-

Reverend Assembly to be a Congregation distinct from the Ephesians, and therefore more Congregations than one making that one Ephesine Church, so much spoken of in the New Testament.

The Answer is,

First, the Church in his house is not necessarily to be understood of a Congregation, such as the proposition intends, but of a family Church, as most of our Divines say.

Secondly, suppose it were such: It doth not appear that the Church in Aquila's house was at Ephesus but in Asia. We read that Aquila and Priscilla travailed with Paul to Ephesus, and were left there, not that their Church was there, for themselves might travaile where their Church travailed not with them.

Thirdly, grant they were such a Church, and at Ephesus, yet the answer is, they were Strangers that were driven from Rome by Claudius, Alts 18.2. compared with Rom. 16. 4. where also we read of a Church in their house, and therefore kept themselves a distinct Church from the Ephesians, as the English doe in the Netherlands, and the Dutch in England; who chuse rather to joyn with their own country people, whose dwellings are more remote, than with those of another nation nearer to them. And if the difference of their language may argue different Congregations; and that they could not joyne in one (as is alledged) it will argue as strongly, that this Church, and the other Congregation of Ephesus, could not be under one Presysterial Government: And ordinary Officers had not ordinarily the gift of severall tongues, I Cor. 12. 8, 9. To one is given the word of Wisdome, to another, Knowledge, to another, diverse kinds of tongues.

Fourthly, as for fewes and Greekes being mentioned; It makes nothing for the number, nor yet that for difference of language, there must needs be more Congregations than one; for the fewes that lived among the Gentiles understood their language, else they would make so many independent Congregations.

Mm2

That

## That the multitude of beleivers were not more then could meet in one place.

The Contrary to this first proposition, viz. that the multitude of beleivers were not more then could meet in one place is proved thus. It is apparent that the number of beleivers there when Paul came first to Ephesius was but about twelve, Acts 19.7. all the men were about twelve. And when the number was increased, yet then the Church of Ephesius is called one flock, in relation to those Elders which were at Ephesius, Acts 20.28. which were willed by Paul to feed that flock by doctrine as he had done, by which its evident they might and did meet in one: for Elders are pastors onely for one congregation.

"It was said that the feeding of this flock is to be understood partitive, "viz. some, one Congregation, some another, and so among st them the flock

" was fed.

But if it be understood partitive with reference to their feeding, it must be also with reference to their overseeing, because it is so express in the text. Take heed to your selves, & to the whole flock over which the holy Ghost bath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God: for no reason can be given why these words feed the flock should be understood partitive, and not these other words take heed to the flock over which the holy Ghost hath made you overseers: and if their overseeing and ruling be to be understood partitive, then how doth this place argue a Presysteriall Government over many Congregations? And if it be said the many Congregations were not fixt ones, then that distinction of feeding partitive falleth to the ground.

"Whereas it is replied that the same phrase as used, I Pet. 5. I. feed the flock of God amongst you, taking the oversight thereof, must be underself-deritood partitive, because those believers and Elders to whom the Apostle Peter writes, were scattered through Pontius, Galatia, Capade-cia, Asia, and Bithinia, which could not meet in one Congregation.

It is Answered.

First, that in this place of Peter there are no such words, whereby the relation of the whole flock is equally carried to all those Elders, as there are in that speech of the Apostle to the Elders of Ephesias, Acts 20.28. take heed to the whole flock over which (whole flock) the holy Ghost hath made you overseers.

Secondly in this I Pet. 5. 1. 4. there are words which plainly point at such a distribution, namely in suit [among you,] applied both to the

Elders

Elders, and to the flock: The Elders in vuiv among you, I exhort to feed the flock in vuiv, that is, each Elders feed your flocks respectively where ere they are among you in each country: therefore though it be understood partitive in Peter, yet it follows not it should be so understood, Al. 20.28

"And if it be said further, that although ruling and teaching be ap"plied to the same flock, the Elders need not be in both alike understood
"partitive to performe their office: because Elders when they rule do
"it in confessus, and all joyn in every act; but when they reach they do
"it severally, each by himself, therefore where ruling and teaching are
"applyed to Elders as over one flock, as they are Acts 20. they may
"well be supposed to do the one partitive, the other not.

The answer is, it is true, where Elders rule, they do it in collegio whether over more or few, and when they teach they do it severally, but still both ruling and teaching are to be within the same compasse, in respect of them who are ruled and taught: for when Elders rule one Congregation in collegio, yet each of these Elders oversee and rule the whole flock as

truely as he can be faid by teaching to feed that whole flock.

As for the second and third propositions, "that there were many El"ders over that people as one flock, and one Church, and that they did go"vern this one flock. The former proposition not being proved, they make
nothing to the proof of that conclusion, That the Scripture holds forth
that many Congregations may be under one Presbyteriall Government.

Sie subscribitur:

Tho. Goodwin,
Philip Nye,
Jer. Burroughes,
Sidrach Sympson.

William Bridge, William Greenhill, William Carter.

Concordat cum Originali.

Adoniram Byfield, Scriba.

Mm3

The



## The Answer of the Assembly of Divines,

Unto the Reasons of the Differting Brethren, against the INSTANCE of the Church of Ephelus.

Our Argument for many Congregations under one Presbyteriall Government, from the Instance of the Church of Ephefus, confished of 3. Propositions.

1. That the multitude of beleevers there, did make more Congrega-

tions then one.

2. There were many Elders over those many Congregations as over one flock.

3. Those severall Congregations were one Church under one Presby-

teriall Government:

Of which our Brethren insist only upon the first, which was proved from

1. Pauls continuance and preaching for the space of three years,

Atts 20. 31. 19, 20.

2. The speciall effect of the word there, that many that believed came and confessed their deeds; many also of them which used curious Arts brought their bookes together, and burned them before all men, and they counted the price of them, and found it to be 50000 pieces of silver: so mightily grew the word of God and prevailed, Acts 19. 18.

3. The mention made of fewes and Greeks, Acts 19. 10. 17.

4. The reason of Pauls stay there, because a great and effectual door was opened. 1 Cor. 16.8,9.

5. Mention made of a particular Church in the house of Aquila and Priscilla, 1 Cor. 16. 19. who were then at Epheses, Acts 18. 19.

All which laid together, do prove the Proposition.

For the right understanding of which proof, we desire that may be considered which our Brethren do not mention, but in the debate was often expressed, and therefore in the vote carefully added. viz. That all these Laid together do prove, &c. arguments of necessity being answerable to the thing they prove: and so though the severall particulars of this proof,

proof should be singly but probabilities, yet being joyned together make a sufficient proof, as many concurring likelihoods in courts amount to a good evidence, and many lesser stars make up a Galaxia: our argument therefore may hold, though their answer (while they take it as funder) should seem to make the severall particulars of it lesse demonstrative: But how doe they endeavour that?

"Tirst, in a faire way of answer, they joyn divers of them together, the Apostle being three years at Ephesius, & his having there a great and effectual door opened, & that expression so mightily grew the word &co. to all which they answer, by denying the consequence, that therefore the converts in Ephesius were more then could meet in one place, and

"that for two reasons.

"I. For suppose it be granted there were two or three thousand so (though there is no sufficient ground to say there were neere so smany) yet they might all meet in one place, and this were enough to shew, that there was a large and effectual door opened to the Apostle, and a comfortable fruit of his so long stay and preaching there.

In our answer to which affertions, we shall consider what they say to the number of believers there, & then how they could all meet in one place.

As to the first, those words of theirs, There is no sufficient ground to fay there were neere so many as two or three thousand in our ordinary use of the phrase, not neer so many, import, that in our Brethrens judgements, the number fell far short of three, nay of two thousand, which in the generall, gives us just occasion in the spirit of meekenesse to defire them to be wary how they use such arguments, or without clear evidence pitch upon such Tenents as force them to make use of them, which as before in the Church of Jerusalem, so here again in the Church of Ephesus, do laboriously indeavour to straiten the number of beleevers, that they might get them all into one roome, so as not to exceed the bounds of one Congregation, which not onely at first blush, but we fear if more neerly looked into, weakens the power of the Gospel in those first most powerfull dispensations of it, and lesseneth the goodnesse of God in that his plentifull redemption: by labouring to make the number of converts as few as possibly may be. Which the Scriptures and both Ancient and Modern Christian Writers are wont frequently and studiously to set out to the full, and amplifie to the greater glory of Christ and his Gospel, which we beleeve our Brethren will be very tender of.

But to the particular in hand, we conceive that we have sufficient ground to thinke that there were more then three, or at least two thou-

fand beleevers in Ephesus in Pauls time, (and much rather afterward when Christ by John writes to them in the Revelation, when yet but one Church chap. 2. 1.) and that, had we no more for it, then what the three particulars by them repeated, may rationally perswade.

The last of which, viz. that expression so mightily grew the word of God, &c. they say nothing to, and therefore it stands for us still in its

strength, for any thing that is said against it.

The second, viz. That large and effectuall door opened to him: being an extraordinary expression, must needs hold forth something more then ordinary, and therefore may reasonably make that great door

wide enough, to let in more then three or two thousand.

But the first is that which our Brethren most insist on, viz. the Apostles long stay & preaching there, & here, though whilst we consider the worth of one soul, we cannot but confesse that the conversion of two or three thousand were (as they truely say) a comfortable fruit of it: yet we cannot say or think it answerable to that abundant blessing, which God in that first plentifull harvest vouchsafed to the endeavours of those his chief labourers, who in the short course of their ministry were to convert the world, especially of Paul, who durst affirme of himself, that he laboured more abundantly then they all, I Cor. 15. 10. and this the rather,

1. If we compare Pauls ministry with Peters, which he himself at least equalleth in the successe of it, Gal. 2. 8. He that wrought effectually in Peter to the Apostleship of the circumcisson, the same was mighty in me towards the Gentiles. Now then if Peter alone preaching (as our brethren in their former Reasons conceived) or say with the rest of the Apostles, did in one day bring in about three thousand soules, Acts 2. 41. and day by day, many more ver. 47. so that within some few dayes, the number was grown up to five thousand, or rather (as we have shewn in our former answer) was increased by the accession of five thousand more, it is very probable that Pauls preaching with his assistants, (for he had some or other ordinarily with him, Act. 15.40. & 16.3.) so many dayes and monthes as made up three years: should within that space bring in near (if not more then) three, or at least two thousand.

2. If we compare his stay, and constant paines at Ephesius, with the whole course of his own ministry, for if in three years abode, and incessant preaching and warning night and day, and that with teares, Als 20.31. (the like expression we finde not elsewhere) he converted not near two thousand soules, (as our Brethren thinke there is no ground to say,) then by the rule of proportion, his harvest among the Gentiles in all the rest of his ministry and life, will be far short of what

we conceive the Acts of the Apostles, and his own Epistles do hold out,

and Divines have generally conceived of it.

3. If we shall consider the happy successe of Pauls ministry in the other particular places, as that he wrought upon a great part of a whole City at one sermon, Ast. 13. 42. 44. on a great multitude of Jewes and Greeks at another, Ast. 14. 1. at another on some of one fort, and on a great multitude of another, and of a third not a few, Ast. 17.4. and the like we have Ast. 18. 8. frow whence it will not be groundlesse to conceive that he might convert near two or three thousand in three years constant course of a settled ministry in Ephesus.

4. If we consider what Ephesus was.

First an exceeding great city: the Metropolis and greatest Mart town of all Asia, within Taurus, as we read in Strabo, & which he saith was every day increasing, when he wrote that, which was about \*30 years \* Lib. 14. before Pauls being there, and therefore by that time grown much grea- In the ter, the very Temple of Diana, that was in it, having a quarter of a mile reigne of round about it for an Asylum or Sanctuary, which must needs make the Tyberius, compasse of the whole city very great.

Secondly, as populous as great: by reason of the great and generall from the concourse of people thither, partly because of Diana, whom all Asia, of his 6. and the world worshipped, Asis 19. 27. and partly for traffick, it be-book: ing by reason of the convenience of its scituation, the greatest Mart and Casautown (as was before said out of Strabo) not only of Asia the lesse, but bone con-

also of the half of Asia the greater.

Thirdly, more Superstitious and Idolatrous, then it was either great years beor populous, it being the place where by reason of Idolatry, sorcery and sore Tibeother sins that usually accompanied them: (as its said of Pergamos, rius his
Revel. 2. 13.) Satan had his seat, Diana her Temple, which they were death.

so brutishly mad upon, Alls 19. 1 Cor. 15. 32.

All which put together adde a great advantage to the successe of the Apostles ministry there, it being better fishing in so wide a sea, and though by reason of the third particular, he might there finde many adversaries, yet he makes account that made not his door there opened any whit narrower, or lesse, but rather more essectuall, it being the end of Christs comming to dissolve the worke of the Devil, 1 John 3.8. and so usually having proved his greater glory, there most to advance his Scepter, where Satan hath had his highest throne, and the mad prophane Ephesian Idolater and Sorcerer not harder to be wrought upon, then the malicious femish Pharisee & Iusticiary, nor did it lesse redound to the glory of God, to redeem the one from Idolatry, then the other from Ceremonies: so that if in fernsalem in few dayes so many thousands were N n

In the reigne of Tyberius, as appears from the conclusion of his 6. book: and Cafaubone conceiveth about 12 years before Tibe-

gained, there may be some ground, (though our Brethren thinke not) to say that in so many years there might at least neer two thousand be con-

verted in Ephesus.

And should we delight in drawing parallels, as our Brethren did in their former Reasons between Acts 2. and Acts 5. we might here do it between what is said of ferusalem and Ephseus. Its said of ferusalem that the word was preached there daily in the Temple, and from house to house, Acts 5. 47. so at Ephesus Paul taught publikely and from house to house. Acts 20. 20. The Apostles at Ferusalem spake the word with boldnesse, Acts 4. 31. so its said did Paul at Ephesus, Acts 19. 8. and Apollos, Acts 18. 26. at ferusalem, many wonders and signes were done by the Apostles, Acts 2.43. and Acts 5. 12. in so much that ver. 15. even the shadow of Peter seemeth to have cured the sick, and at Ephesus God wrought special miracles, swapers in no ordinary ones by the hand of Paul, Act. 19.11, 12.10 that from his body were brought handkerchiefes and aprons, which did great miracles, and as some thinke, greater then Peters shadow did: and if upon the one, great multitudes were brought in, as its said there were, Acts 5. 14. why then not upon the other?

And as these wonders struck fear upon the Church of ferusalem, and upon them that heard of them, Ads 5. 11. so also at Ephesus,

Act. 19. 17.

The extraordinary effect of the word at ferusalem, was expressed by extraordinary acts of believers, as in selling their goods, &c. Acts 2. 45. Acts 5. 34. so at Ephesus in confessing their deeds, and openly burning their books, Acts 19. 18, 19.

In the Church of Jerusalem its said the word of God increased, Act. 6.

7. and grew, Acts 12. 24. so at Ephesus, Acts 19. 20.

So that if ferusalem and Ephesus in all these particulars were parallel, and if in bigness equall, why should we judge that in the number of converts they should be so unproportionable, that when in the Scripture we read that in one of them there were in two dayes brought home at least five thousand, our Brethren should think that there is no ground to say that in three years time of Pauls constant incessant preaching and weeping, there were neere three or two thousand converted in the other.

5. If lastly we take notice of the fair way and great advance that was made for the happier progresse of Pauls settled ministry in Ephesius, by the foregoing labours of Aquila and Apollos, both able and faithfull, and the latter set out to be very powerfull, and diligent, and earnest in the worke: and this for some longer time, to the bringing in of disci-

ples

ples of note with forraigne Churches, Acts 18.19. Ad finem, who whether they were but about the number of twelve, (as our Brethren afterward fay) we shall consider when we come to that place, and hope we shall make it appear to be otherwise; mean while, comparing this fifth particular with all the former, and taking in those first fruits of Ephesus before Pauls settled ministry there, with the rich and plentifull harvest of his three years after labours, we conceive (under favour) contrary to what our Brethren peremptorily affert, that there were neer two or three thousand believers in the Church of Ephesus.

2. "But they supposing there were no more, adde that so many as

"two or three thousand might all meet in one place.

We answer, but if there were more (as from what hath been said may be gathered) then we have more cause to say they might not: no not though they were but two or three thousand.

Partly in regard of Ephesus, it being an heathenish City, mad upon their Idol Diana, and her worship, and therefore not likely either to assigne, or allow them a publike meeting place for the ordinary and

constant exercise of a contrary Religion.

And partly in regard of some special duties of Church communion, particularly of receiving the Sacrament: especially if sitting at a table, (as the manner then seemes to have been) which no roome in a private house would have been large enough for. And if it be said, that they met in the schoole of Tyrannus, Acts 19.9. which was a more publike place, and might be capacious enough for such a number, in such a service: We answer, we cannot say how large it was, nor can they prove that it was so large: but this we can say, that we read not of the Disciples receiving the Sacrament, but only of Pauls disputing there; that schoole being of that use then and there to Paul, which the Temple at ferusalem was before to the other Apostles, viz. not the place of their select Church meeting for such ordinances, of which the Disciples were onely partakers, but where (having indeed separated from the fews, and left their Synagogue) he disputed or reasoned (Finey our with others as well as Christians, Acts 19.9, 10.

"2. Their second reason of denying the consequence, is because this "efficacy of the word preached by Paul, hath reference not onely "to Ephesns, but also to all Asia, as they gather from the words of "Demetrius, Acts 19. 26. and when Paul Acts 20. 31. saith for "the space of three years, he coused not to warne every one both day and "night with tears: the words are not to be restrained to his being at

<sup>&</sup>quot;Ephesus, but to be understood of his being in Asia, as appears by vers. 18. ye know from the first day that I came into Asia, &c.

1. We readily grant that the efficacy of Pauls ministry was not confined to Ephesus, but reached to all Asia, which we take up, not upon Demetrius his trust, Acts 19. 26. but from the holy Ghosts own words, Acts 19. 10. Ephesus being the place of greatest resort from all quarters both for traffique and the worship of Diana: and so the filling of Asia with converts, was not so much by Pauls going abroad out of Ephesus, as by those multitudes slocking thither, and hearing him at Ephesus; whence we may infer two things to our purpose from this instance of Ephesus, as we did in our answers to their former reasons, from that of Jerusalem.

hearing Paul in Ephesus, its very likely that diverse of them might change their habitations, and come and sit down at Ephesus by the Apostles constant ministry there, and so adde to the increase of that

Church.

2. That if his doctrine filled all Asia, then much more proportionably it filled Ephesus, where it was constantly by the Apostle himself preached, and from whence it spred into other parts abroad.

2. Whereas they say this efficacy of the word, hath reference not only to Ephesus, but also to all Asia: we answer, that this efficacy, namely that which we proved out of Acts 19. 18, 19, 20. in those many converts confessing their deeds, and burning their bookes, so mightily grew the word, &c. doth so plainly and clearly relate to Ephesus where the thing was done, that it needeth no other proof then the very looking on the Text.

3. For that speech of Demetrius, Acts 19. 26. as we did not cite it, so need we not much to heed it, he would be sure out of his malice to take in, and snatch at all he could, ad invidian & odium exaggerandum: and what though the efficacy of Pauls doctrine reached all Asia, as Demetrius speech (which they alledge) afferts: doth that hinder it to have a more speciall efficacy in Ephesus, which our proof plainly manifelts? they being two distinct things, and their allegation not crossing, but confirming ours: if the efficacy of Pauls ministry was so great in all Asia, as they truly affirme, then was it much greater in Ephesus as we inferred upon the grounds before mentioned.

4. For that of Acts 20. 31. by us alleadged for Pauls three years aboade and preaching at Ephelus, which they lay, must not be restrained to Ephelus, but intended to Asia, which they prove from vers. 18. we say,

1. That in Acts 19. 8, 9, 10. there seemes to be expresse mention of his aboad at Ephesius for two years, and three moneths, which is a great part of the three years, nor is it unlikely but the businesse in that chapter further

further related, might help well to make up the rest, or should we take in (as some do) that passage of his through the upper coasts, Als 19.1. before his first comming to Ephesus, within the compass of those 3 years, and grant also that whilst he remained at Ephesus he looked sometimes abroad, (though that we read not of) yet no constant aboad, nor any longer stay of his do we find any where else for that time, which should it falls short of some weekes, or two or three moneths of three years, yet Retundatio numeri is no stranger in Scripture accounts, & its sufficient for the purpose which we brought it for:namely, to shew that his so long aboad at Ephesus, and his constant instant preaching there with tears, might in all likelihood convert more then could for all acts of worship be but one Congregation, to meet in one place.

2. For that which is urged from verf. 18. from the first day that I came into Asia, &c. we say, true indeed the precise first day that he came into Asia, he might not come to Ephesus, as Acts 19. 1. yet

First, that phrase and new the first day, by an Hebraisme, may be very well taken in some latitude, and put for the beginning of his accesse into those parts, as if he had said, from my first comming in-

to Asia, in a manner, I have beene with you all the while.

Secondly, this makes more for our purpose, that he tels the Elders of Ephesus, that he had been so constantly with them, that in a manner from the first day of his comming into Asia, he had not been absent from them, so that the more that our Brethren stand to the precise first day of his comming into Asia, the more they gratiste us, thereby allowing him the more time for his being at Ephesus, which we plead for.

Thirdly, but in case it be objected that this followeth not, because our Brethren here expressly affirme that the Apostles meaning is of Asia, and not onely of Ephesus, and so his speech is directed to the Elders of all Asia, and not of Ephesus onely: we confesse that in our answers to their former reasons, we said that some so thought, but did never thinke that our Brethren would, which because here they do, they will give us leave to remind them, that in their former answers they were of a contrary judgement, that they were the Elders of the Church of Ephesus only, and that which was included in the bounds of one only Congregation. But if now they be the Elders not only of Ephesus, butalso of Asia, that he speaks to, vers. 18. and in vers. 17. we have them expressed, by recoburges of emandas, Elders of the Church in the singular number, then upon this supposition we have here found an Asian Nationall Church, and a further proof of the proposition we are upon, that very many particular Congregations may be under one Presbyterial Government.

But having thus far in their Answer more fairly put three of our Ar-

guments together, in what follows, they otherwise then we intended, take the rest assumer, and here single out that, out of Acts 19. 18,19, 20, and pitch only upon the price of the bookes: to which they answer,

"That according to Calvins account, the 50000 pieces of filver amount but to 9000.1. French, which is about 670.1. sterling at
"18. d. the Franke according to the Bezea, but to 8700.1.
"French, and according to Brerewood (who estimates every àsyvision
at7.d.ob.) but to 1406.1. which some one mans study now of common bookes, and not manuscripts (as they were) is worth,
at therefore then, when there was no Printing, a few mens books,
yea, a few books of so curious and gainfull Arts, might well be
worth that money, and then how doth this argue such a multitude of beleevers as could not meet in one Congregation?

To which we reply, and complain herein of a double wrong, that not only this whole proof from Acts 19.18,19,20. that it may be the easilier broken is pluck't as a single arrow out of the sheafe, whereas we had bound it up with the rest it had more strength, but also that whereas there were four things in it argumentative to our purpose, all which we looked at, our Brethren pitch onely upon this third of them, which

we least of all regarded.

1. The first was, that many of severall sorts of persons are there expressed, many that believed came and confessed, vers. 18. and againe, many of them that used curious Arts, brought their bookes, &c. vers. 19. which words seeme to distribute the believers there into three ranks:

1. Such as had used curious Arts, and there were snavos sufficient store of them. 2. Other believers that came and confessed their deeds, and there were πόρλοι many more of them: and 3. They imply that there were other Disciples that did believe, but did not then come, for this said that πόρλοι π πεωισευκότων, many of them that believed came, which argues they were other believers, that did not, which might be a greater number. 4

But all three forts put together, might make a number so great as

may be considerable to our present purpose.

2. The second thing we looked at in that place, was their bringing of their books and burning them before all men, which as Mr. Carturight observes they durst not have done, had they not been, if not the major part, yet such a sufficient number, which might even in that populous City have carried out that action, which could not but by the opposite party be deeply distasted. In Queen Maries time a small number of Protestants durst not have burnt their Mass-books in Cheapside; it was when Luthers Doctrine began generally to be received, that he burnt the Popes Decretals in Wittenberg.

3. The

2. The third thing was the price of the books burnt, amounting to 50000 pieces of filver, which because we found in the Text, we set down in our proof, but did very little infift upon in our debate, and yet this only our Brethren pitch upon in their answer, as hoping to overthrow our argument in wounding of it, in what they conceive to be the weakest part of it. But we have seen the strength of what they say against it. In our reply whereto, we shall not need to trouble the Honourable Houses nor our selves, either in calling our Brethren to account for casting up 9000. 1. French to about 670. 1. sterling, at 18. d. the Frank, which if it be 2.5. the Frank, (as some say) will amount to 900.1. sterling, or againe for casting up 5000 pieces of 7.d. ob. the piece to about 1406.l. which comes to 1562.1.10.s.or in examining Culvins or Bezaes or Breremoods account, though the last of the three in the same place cited acknowledgeth a duplex Argenteum Hebr: Mat. 27. 15. and that he acknowledgeth, 2.s. 6.d. Gracum, which he rates at 7. d. ob. and though he pitcheth upon the latter, as meant in this place, yet we want a cogent argument to evince it; for though the thing were done in Ephefus, where they would reckon it according to their coyne: yet what hinders, but that while Luke relates it, he might expresse it according to the coyne of his owne Country, as an English man writing of what was fold in the Low-countries for so many flivers, or dollars, according to our English coyne, may fay it was fold for so many (proportionably) pence or shillings? And if so here and the Argenteum Hebraum be meant, and that were of the value before mentioned, these 50000 silverings will amount to 6250. I. sterling, which would help well to furnish many of our studies: and sure there are not now, when the world is fo full of bookes, many particular men, who have in their greatest overgrown Libraries, bookes of that value, being all of the same art or faculty as these were, especially of such a kind of study as this was, which indeed was curious, and it may be gainfull as our Brethren say: but such as either few studied, and so they had few chapmen for their bookes, and so their price was lesse, or if many did as the Text implies (the Eosaa yegupara being then famous) then there was more store of them, and so they were not such rarities as our Manufcripts now are, which raiseth their price amongst us. But as we will not fay, how much fuch fluffe, as they were, was well worth, as our Brethrens words are, so can neither they nor we tell what was the rate of their written bookes then, that the bookes were not few, (as our Brethren feem to thinke they might be) the Text implies, but that the men were many (which is the thing that we most stand upon ) it plainly expresseth, and this price of the books help's to prove both unlesse our Brethren can thevy

Thew that the bookes were great volumes, and that of many and feverall Arguments and Authors: For should they be but small books. there must be many of them that should arise to such a summe. They would be very many Primers or Grammars that would amount to 6250. l. or till it be but to their 1406. l. and should they not be many, but most what the same Authors and Arguments (as generally all Students in a science, have the same principall and fundamentall books of it) then many books would argue many owners, and fo many books that should amount to such a summe, would prove very many practitioners, whom if you consider either as learned, many of which are not called I Cor. 1. or as deeply ingaged in Satans depths and mysteries, and so lesse hope of their learning to know Jesus Christ, you must need sconclude, that if so many of them, then very many more of other forts & ranks, in that populous City were converted unto Christ, that might fill more then one Congregation, and this particular, how ever our Brethren seeme to undervalue, yet the holy Ghost pleaseth to set an especiall marke on it, in his Epiphonematical acclamation, which thereupon he makes, ver. 20.

4. Which is the 4.branch of this proofe that we infifted on, so mightily grew the word of God and prevailed, which plainly sheweth, that the holy Ghost summed not up the value of those ungodly books onely, to shew the dearnesse of them, but the multitude also of those that had burnt them. For had he said onely that the Word of God prevailed ixis, it might have related to the great power it had to make those men willingly to put themselves to so great a losse, and so the sewer the men had been, their losse had been the greater, and the Word had prevailed with them the more: but there is added also the number of the word of God increased, which Calvin saith, relates to the number of the men that had done that thing, and which in those two other Ast. 6.7. and Ast. 12. 24. (where alone this kind of speech is used) expressent the great increase of multitudes of believers, as we shewed in our answers

to our Brethers former Reasons.

To our instance of a particular Church in Aquilas house, our Brethren Answer,

"1. That is not necessary to be meant of a Congregation, such as the proposition intends, but of a Family Church, as most of our Di-

" vines fay.

1. For the judgement of Divines, though divers think as our Brethren fay; yet many are of another minde: Bullinger and Erasmus on Rom. 6. 15. read it, the Congregation in their house. Lyra so expounds it, on which place Gualther thus, Ecclesian habuerunt domesticam, i.e. domum suam

suam Ecclesia Consecrarunt ut in ea haberentur sacri cœtus: And Oecume- So Oecumenius, though he alleadge both interpretations, and so doth Deodate, yet he nius fets this in the first place, and for I Cor. 16.19 the interlineary gloss hath like saying Congregatione fratrum. And though Beza would have it understood of of Nyma Family, yet both he and Deodate note on this place, that in one and the phas. Col. same City there were more Assemblies or Congregations of the faithful 4. 15. then one. Pet. Martyr on Rom. 16. and 1 Cor. 16. faith, the words may suffer a double exposition, either of a Congregation, or of their own family; but he faith the former is more probable: And so doth M. Mede, which I understand not to be spoken of their families, but of the congregation of the Saints there wont to assemble for the performance of divine duties & ouveexceptile nat' olkov auth Enkandar.

2. For reasons which may perswade us to continue still in this our

judgement, we have thefe.

1. We find the same word before, so used in the same verse, the Apofile in the beginning of it had faid, the Churches of Afia salute you, and after addes the Church in Aquila, and Priscillas house, as one of that number, and of note, for forwardnesse and love to the Saints, and if the story of AEts 18. be well considered, their opinion will be probable, who make it the first Church that was in Ephesus.

2. We finde not elsewhere in Scripture, the name of a Church given to a Family: But on the contrary in that very Chapter, where the Apostle meaneth the persons of any ones Family, he useth another phrase, as Foixiar, verf. 15. not exxansiar, and Rom. 16. 10. 11. The extly, and

τεν σῦν αὐτοῖς, verse 14. and the like.

3. The Church in their house is distinguished from themselves, so that it must then be meant of their Children or Servants, or some strangers that lodged in their house, but these to be so saluted, and as a

Church, feemes no way probable.

4. This of having a Church in their house, is only spoken of three. Of Nymphas, Col. 4. 15. of Philemon, Thilem. 1. 2. and of Aquila and Priscilla, Rom. 16.4,5.1 Cor. 16.19. But shall we think, that in those prolix Catalogues of falutations, none had Christian Families but these three that are thus remembred? No! We read besides, of them of the houshold of Aristobulus, Rom. 16.10. and Narcissus, ver. 11. and of them that were with Asyncretus, Phlegon, Hermas, Patrobas & Hermes, v. 14. and of the houshold of Onesiphorus, 2 Tim. 4. 19. and yet no mention of Churches in their houses, which expression therefore, must not hold out a godly Family, which was common to many, but some speciall thing peculiar to them, to whom it is applyed. And what should this be, but what we now plead for? Namely, a Congregationall Church used to meet

meet in Aquilas and Priscillas house. 5. Which agreeth well with their qualifications, the man being a Preacher, and both Pauls helpers in Christ, Rom. 16.3. & instructers of Apollos. Act. 18.16. in the fore-rank of Beleevers, and therefore in their house

rather then anothers might be the meeting of the Disciples.

6. The phrase also rat' ofnor is the same with that 48t. 2. 46. which speakes of a Congregationall meeting, and that word is in all the foure

places. 7. This exposition also agreeth with other places, where we finde Church meetings in private houses, because of the persecution of those times, AEt. 12.12. 20.8. 19.9. 28. 23. but we passe over this, and come

to their fecond Answer, it is,

2 "Suppose it were a Congregation, yet it doth not appear that "the Church in Aquilas house was at Ephesius, but in Asia: we reade, "that Aguila and Priscilla travelled with Paul to Ephesus, and were e left there; not that their Church was there, for themselves might travel. " where their Church travelled not with them.

1. We hope our Brethren doe not intend to deny Ephesius to be in Asia, (as their words seeme to imply) when they say that it appears not, that the Church in Aquilas house was at Ephesus, but in Asia; nay, if in Ephelus, then in Alia, but if they mean in some other place in Alia, we fay,

2. It no where in Scripture appeares, that Aguila seated himselfe in any other place of Asia, but in Ephesus; or that the Church in his

house, was any where in Asia, if not in Ephesus.

3. We may not suppose that they, and their Church parted without great Causes; now we read not of any such particular cause, why they should part, or that de fasto they did; at Rome we finde them together, Rom. 16. 45. and at Corinth, as it may seeme from their acquaintance with the Church of Corinth, as appears from the falutation, 1 Cor. 16.19. which place doth more clearely prove that they were together at Ephefus also, for thence it appeares they were at that place, from whence the Apostle wrote that Epistle, which though the spurious Post-script saith was from Philippi, yet both the Syriack and Arabick Translatours, Oecumenius, and generally, both Protestant and Popish Writers agree, that it was from Ephesus, and prove it from 1 Cor. 16. 5. 8. with Att. 19. 21, 22. and by diverse other arguments there, then both Aquila and his houshould, and the Church in his house were, and Paul with them as fojourning, if we give credence to the addition that we meet with in Ambrose, apad quos hospiter, and which Bezasaith, he found in some ancient Latine Copies.

Beza, Deodate, Theorndike, Cudwerth, and Baronius, C. à Lapide, coc.

But our Brethren as it seemeth, not much trusting to these two first allegations, passe on to that, which they say, is the Answer: and what is that?

"3. Grant they were a Church, and at Ephesus; yet the Answer is, "they were strangers that were driven from Rome by Claudius, "AE.18.2.with Rom. 16.3,4 & therefore kept themselves a distinct "Church from the Ephesus, as the Dutch in England, who chuse rather to joyne with their owne Country people, whose dwel- lings are more remote, then with those of another Nation nearer to them. And if the difference of their language may argue different Congregations, and that they could not joyne in one, (as is alleadged) it will argue as strongly, that this Church and the other Congregation at Ephesus could not be under one Presubtrials Government: and ordinary officers had not ordinarily the gift of severall tongues, 1 Cor. 12.8, 9. to one is given, &c.

But THE Answer perhaps may prove none: for

1. Not to insist on that (which yet we cannot but take notice of) viz. That by what they here say they make account that Aquila and Prifeilla, and the Church in their house, being first at Rome, Rom. 16.4, 5. and expelled thence be the edict of Claudius, came to Ephesus, and were then that Church mentioned, 1 Cor. 16. 19. which is a foule mistake in Cronologie, that first Epist. to the Corinthians, though set after in our Bibles, being written before that to the Romans, and so that Church of theirs then at Ephesus, when mentioned 1 Cor. 16. was before that being of

it at Rome, mentioned Rom. 16.

2. There is no likelihood that Aquila and Priscilla, though strangers, would yet estrange and withdraw themselves to a peculiar Church dissevered from the Presbyterie by the Apostles there settled: their Christian wisedome, charity, and zeale for the promoting of Gods glory, and their owne and others good, would not suffer them to withdraw themselves from that communion of Saints, and rob themselves of such a blessed advantage and opportunity, especially the partition wall between few and Gentile being known now to be broken down, which the Apostle speakes so fully to in his Epittle to these Ephesians. And therefore for some reasons, they might be a distinct Congregation, which our argument afferts: yet for these reasons they would not be such a distinct Church, as to sever themselves from so usefull an association in a joynt Government.

3. There was not the like severing themselves from the Church in Ephelin, as is and hath been from the French and Dutch Churches, keeping themselves distinct from the English, namely, difference of Church-

0 0 2 govern-

government, which was the speciall cause of their earnest renitency, when the Bishops strong hand would have violently bowed them

to it.

92

4. The difference of language, we showed might be an argument for severall Congregations in the instance of the Church of ferusalem, because the fewes language was not in such common use, and yet not so even there, but that they might well be under one Presbyterial Government, as appears from our Answer to our Brethrens first Reasons, where this part of their argument is answered, to which we refer.

But it was not alleadged by us here in this instance of the Church of Ephesius, the Greek tongue being then of more common use, and the Jewes that lived among the Gentiles understanding their language, as our Brethren themselves tell us in their next and last Answer, which is

this,

"As for fewes and Greeks being menti oned, it makes nothing to the "number, nor yet that for difference of language there must needs

" be more Congregations then one: For the fewes that lived a-"mong the Gemiles, understood their language, else they would

" make fo many Independent Congregations.

1. As to that first clause, wherein they say, the mentioning of fews and Greeks makes nothing to the number: we say, yes sure, we doubt not but our Brethren will grant us it maketh something, if they consider

1. That in both the verses cited, Alls 19. 10, 17. there is an [ALL] mentioned, ALL fewes and Greeks, and we hope that all is something

to the number.

2. That there is an addition of one ALL to the other, of Greeks to fews ซลับเข Is Saises Te น่า Exxnoi, the bare adding of Greeks to fews speakes an addition of number, & when the holy Ghost joynes them with a 72 x41, he tels us, he would have us take notice of it, that he intends an addition of Greeks to Jewes to increase the number, and when there is an addition of an All of the one, to an All of the other; (which was very great in so large & populousacity) such a great increase, as (at least joyned with other proofs) may make something for our purpose, even to make up more then one fingle Congregation. Paul for certain intended to expresse some inlargement of the number of them to whom he was a debtor, when he said he was debtor "Emnoi re uni Bagsa'eois, o'ogois re uni avontous, in the same phrase Rom. 1. 14. and of that ALL of beleevers, when he faid the Gospel was the power of God to falvation, may 71 md m-TEVENTA, Issain Te noi "Exclus, in the lame word vers. 16. it would be taken to make much for the increase of the number, if when we had said all English men should take the Covenant, we should adde, all English

men

### the dissenting Br. against the Instance of the Ch: of Ephesus.

men and Scotch men also, and this was all that we meant, by producing

the mention of all both fewes and Greeks.

2. For as for that which in the second clause our Brethren adde, as though we here meant, that for difference of the language of Jewes and Greeks there must needs be more Congregations then one, we again say, it was alledged by us to that purpose before, in the Instance of the Church of Jeru alem, but not in this of the Church of Ephesus for the reason aforesaid, and therefore this part of their answer, is to a supposition of their own, but to no argument of ours now in hand.

- 3. And therefore that Reason which they adde, For the Jews that lived among the Gentiles understood their language: consutes nothing that we said, but serves to answer to what they themselves objected a little before in their third answer, and to clear this truth, that though Aquila and Priscilla were strangers, and of a different language, and so might be in a distinct Congregation, yet this difference of their language from that of Ephesia, seeing they understood it, could be no hinderance, but that they with the rest of the Ephesian believers, might well be under one and the same Presbyteriall Government.
- 4. Though for that which they adde in the close, that unlesse they understood their language, they would have made so many Independent Congregations, we might justly deny the consequence: for though upon that ground of different language they might well make several distinct Congregations, yet it followeth not, that therefore they should be Independent ones, but notwithstanding it might be under one common Ecclesiastical government, as suppose the Welch should not generally understand our English, yet they might be (as they are) under the same civil government with us: all of Aquila and Priscilla's Church might not understand the Ephesian language, and so it might be necessary they should be preached to in a distinct Congregation, by such of their owne whose language all might understand, whereas so many only as might joyne with the rest of the common Presbytery in point of common Government, had need to have understood the Ephesian language: nay two men may be fit to joyne in a common Government, though they do neither of them understand one anothers native speech, if they did both understand a third language.

Our Brethren having thus indeavoured to Answer our argument from this Instance of the Church of Ephesus, for the proposition that there were more believers there, then did make one Congregation: in the next place, they bring their arguments against it.

"The first whereof is this: They say it is apparent that the number of

003 "be

" beleevers there, when Paul came first to Ephesus, was but about

" 12. Acts 19.7. All the men were about twelve.

1. Its an apparent mistake of our Brethren to say, that it was Pauls first comming to Ephesus, when he met with those 12 men mentioned Act. 19. 7. if they had but minded the foregoing Chapter, Acts 18. 19, 20, 21. they might have found him there, and departed thence, before this his after comming and return thither, mentioned in this 19. Chap.

2. It is apparent that all men there particularly spoken of, were not above 12. but it is nothing lesse then apparent that there were then no

more Disciples at Ephesus, but the contrary rather is apparent.

1. From what we read vers. 1. that Paul found there τιγὰς μαθηλάς, not τ μαθητὰς, Disciples indefinitely, or the Disciples that were there, as we have that phrase, Acts 21. 4. but τινὰ μαθητὰς, certain Disciples by way of distinction from the rest (for τινὰς & πάντες are not termini convertibiles) as either being the first that upon his comming thither he met with, or that after he had this speciall intercourse with the story whereof is there related, some certaine speciall Disciples that were of that judgement and way, which would argue rather that there were some of another, at least doth not argue there were not any besides, no more then if it should be said that one in Queen Maries daies comming to Frankesord found πτὰς, some that stood for the book of Common Prayer, it would be thence concluded that

all there were of that judgement.

2. From that great space of time, which came between Pauls first being at Ephelus, Chap. 18. and this finding of those 12 at his second comming in the 19 Chap. and the meanes of conversion and falvation, which they injoyed in that interim. In that time Paul goes from Ephesus to Cesarea, and so from one place to another in order, strengthening the Disciples, Act. 18.32,23. and after through the upper coasts, Act. 19.1. which journies & his staics in some of the places mentioned, would take up some longer time, & in that time, Aquila and Priscilla were at Ephesus and there not idle, as appears from what they did to Apollos, who also came thither in that time, that eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures, who being instructed in the way of the Lord, and being fervent in the Spirit, taught diligently the things of the Lord, and this as may seeme to the Disciples in their Church meetings vers. 27. and being added after as a distinct thing verf. 26. that he began to speak boldly in the Synagogue. now what a poor harvest would it have been onely to have gleaned up but 12 raw ignorant Disciples by the paines of such faithfull

Act. 18. 18,19. and earnest labourers so long continued in these growing times, wherein the word had another kinde of successe then now it hath usually. And yet even in our dayes, meaner men or women then Apollo, Aquila, and Priscilla, if they bestir themselves as they did, in a lesse time can tell how to gaine more then above twelve sollowers.

3. Answerably in the third place this appeares from the successe that Aquilas and Apollos labours had in that interim, for Acts 18. 27. we read that there were Brethren so considerable, that when Apollos was disposed to goe to Achaia, they were able to commend him to the Disciples there, exhorting them to receive him, Act. 18. 27. with authority: so few and ignorant Disciples, were not likely to rise up with the Corinthians in Achaia, who were so enriched with all utterance and knowledge, 1 Cor. 1.5.

4. These 12. were raw and ignorant, Act. 19.2. and onely instructed in Johns Baptisme, v.3. as Apollos was, when he first came to Ephesus. Act. 18. 25. But Aquila and Priscilla better instructed him, ver. 26. and so certainly would they have done these twelve also, if they had been of their Congregation; so that they could not be all the Disciples that were there, there was Aquila and his Church beside, of which some conceive those Brethren, Act. 18. 27. were.

But Calvin is confident they were not these twelve.

5. He also conceives, they might be speciall men, and such as Beza conceives were made Officers there, which way that passage, ver. 6. of Pauls imposing of hands on them, and their, thereupon speaking with tongues and Prophesying seemeth something to propend. Now if so, it wil be no sound reasoning of our Brethren, that because there were about twelve, whom the Aposte ordained for Officers,

that therefore there should be no more Disciples.

3. But grant there had been but about twelve then, yet because then, an handfull of corne on the top of the mountaine was so mightily to increase, as after, to shake like Lebanon, Psal.72.16. there might soone be more, then to take up one onely Congregation, before Johns writing his Revelation, which was so many yeeres after, and yet then Ephesus but one Church, Rev.2.1. Nay in Pauls time, after his own three yeers ministry there, as was before shewed, together with the assistance of divers others his fellow-labourers there in this work, (which was the Assemblies second proofe, but our Brethren touch it not) as Luke, who was with Paul in all these his travailes, Ast. 16. 16, 17. compared with Ass. 20.5, 6. Sosthenes, for he is joyned with him in the front of the sirft Epistle to the Corinths, 1 Cor.1.1. which was written from Ephesus,

as we shewed before, Aquila, Alt. 18.19. and 1 Cor. 16. 19. Timotheus and Erastus, whom he sent not from Ephesus till towards his owne departure thence, Alt. 19.22. to whom he might adde Gains & Aristarcus, Alt. 19.29. and 20.4. if they were Preachers, as is probable they were all which must have more then one Congregation to be imployed in.

"And when the number was increased, yet then the Church of Ephe"sum is called one flock, in relation to those Elders which were at
"Ephesus, Att. 20.28. which were willed by Paul to feed that flock
by doctrine as he had done, by which it is evident they might
and did meet in one: for Elders are Pastors onely to one Con-

"gregation.

I. It was but even now that these both Elders and Flock were made by our Brethren to be of all Asia, and not onely of Ephesus, when it would help them to deny the consequence of our argument, but here to make out their owne argument, they must not be of all Asia, (for then we should hope there would be more Congregations then one) but must be confined to Ephesus onely; so they were in their former Reasons, but extended to all Asia in the former part of this Answer, and now in the third place contracted against to Ephesus. This, if an inadvertency, may easily be pardoned, but such a liberty to contract and extend at pleasure for present advantage (if we may call it an advantage)

must not be granted.

2. There is no sufficient reason why our Brethren should restrain that feeding, which the Apostle there gives, in charge to feeding by Doctrine onely, which yet they doe, when they say, that they were willed by Paul, to feed that flock, by Doctrine as he had done. For 1. its welknown, that as in Homers, so in Scripture language, would and would by hold forth feeding by ruling, as well as teaching, Mat. 2. 6. 2. Paul fed them by ruling as well as teaching, and so must they, if they must doe as he had done.

3. Some expressions both in Act. 20. and Rev. 2. concerne Government as well as Doctrine: And if our Brethren cannot deny, but both belonged to those Elders, which the Apostle there spake to; what reason is there, that when he exhorted them to their duty, he should be thought to exhort them to one part of it, and say nothing to the other, especially when the word and expression he useth, doe in their true signification reach both?

3. But the true reason why our Brethren do here single out teaching, and leave out ruling; is, because that would best sit their present argument, which in brief is this. At Ephesus, its evident there was then but one Congregation, because but one flock. At. 20. 28. and that in reference to feeding Elders or Pastors, and Pastors are onely of one Con-

gregation,

gregation, to which we reply and fay: that

dent expressions: Here, its evident; a sittle before, its apparent; and a sittle after, no reason can be given; and againe, plainly point it, &cc. which we humbly convince, is nor so, nor so. And if this they here say, that all Beleevers in Ephesus, might and did meet in one, be not made more evident then that (as they before said) it was apparent that there were but about 12. Believers when Paul came first to Ephesus, Ast. 19.7, in which they hold out that to be his first comming, we hope we shall not be convicted by such evidences.

2. Should we say, that by an enallage numeri flock is put for flocks, as there is nothing in that place (we conceive) that crosseth it, so many

inltances thereof, in other Scriptures may justifie it.

3. But take it (as it is) in the singular number, flock, yet why may it not be taken collective for such a flock, as contained in it, diverse particular flocks, as we read expressly, Gen. 33. 13. Jacob saith of his, The flockes are with me, and if men should over-drive them one day, all the flock would dye: Here is a full parallel to Lukes ward of wouries, a war workers, all the flock in the singular, is said to have severall particular flocks, as parts of it. And so Christs little flock, and one feld, unpod workers, Luke 12.32. and that win wolfers flock and fold in generall, namely the Church Catholick; yet comprehendeth many particular flocks and Churches contained in it, and under it, as we have in our former answers shewn, there were many particular Congregations, in Jerusalem, and yet it but one Church; and governed by one common Presbytery.

4. Whereas upon occasion of the word feed, the word Pastor is urged, Elders being Pastors to one onely Congregation; we answer, that the word Pastor is not in the Text, but onely the word feed, and that, we have already shewn, reacheth to governing as well as teaching, and therefore that although use hath obtained, that the word Pastor is commonly taken for the Minister of one Congregation, (the Bishop having injuriously appropriated that title to himselfe, and to his single inspection over many Congregations) yet according to that signification of the word (as it relates to Government) there is no inconveniency, that many Elders associated for Government, may be eateness, called Passors of the many Congregations that are under their joynt inspection.

But whereas it was faid in the Assembly, that that feeding of the flock (especially as it related to teaching) was to be understood partitive, viz. some one Congregation, some another, and so amongst them the flock was fed.

P p

Our

Our Brethren object,

"That if it be understood partitive with reference to their feeding,
"it must be also with reference to their overseeing, because it
"is so express in the Text, Take heed to your selves, and to the whole
"slocke, over which the holy Ghost hath made you overseers to feed the
"Flock of God: For no reason can be given why these words, feed
"the flock; should be understood partitive, and not these other
"words, Take heed to the flocke, over which the holy Ghost hath made
"you overseers; and if their overseeing and ruling be to be under"stood partitive, then how doth this place argue a Presbyteri"all Government over many Congregations? And if it be said
"the many Congregations were not fixt; then that distinction
"of feeding partitive falleth to the ground.

1. We doe not fay, that those many Congregations were not fixt, but rather hold that they were, as not conceiving how Pauls long residence there should not form them into such a more orderly settlement, that so they might feed their severall flocks partitive, as in the Assembly

was said they did.

2. Whereas our Brethren doe here seeme to make these two words, δποκόσως and σοιμαίνων, to signifie the two distinct parts of a Pastors duty; the first his ruling, and the latter by seeding and teaching; its to be conceived rather, that all these three words in the Text, επακόσως, σερούχων and σοιμαίνων have all of them reference both to their ruling and teaching, for in both, they ought δποκοσών, σερούχων,

and somairer, to overfee, take heed, and feed.

3. Suppose then, that would by or feeding, doth contains the exercise of all their duty, as they are discovered, or overseers: yet its not necessary, that the feeding in the severall branches or offices of it, should in the same manner be executed. As suppose (for example) the King should charge the Justices of the Peace in a whole County, being convened, that they carefully governe and doe Justice, to the People committed to their charge; their power and office being such, as its known to be, must needs be conceived, that for that part of it, in taking examinations, binding over to the Sessions, and the like; he meaneth they should doe it divisim, within their severall precincts: But for that other part of executing of justice on persons so bound over, indicted and arraigned, they should doe it Conjunctim, in Concessor, at the Sessions or Assizes, and so the like here.

4. But suppose, (according to our Brethrens sense) this over-sight and feeding, should expresse the two distinct parts of their office, the one their ruling, the other their teaching; yet such manner of joyning

them

them together as we finde in the Text, doth not imply that they should both be exercised the same manner and way, it being usuall in Scripture, to speak of things put together indifferently and alike, which yet are to be considered differently according to their diverse capacities, and so though these two be thus joyned together, yet the one may be divisim, and the other conjunctim: As suppose in a like manner of speech, it should be said to the Ministers of one Congregation, being many, Take heed to the flocke, over which God hath made you overseers, that you preach the Word to them; and take that word Overseers, as our Brethren doe, for their ruling power, that (they will say) must be exercised conjunctim, and yet this preaching they will not deny, but must be done divisim and partitive.

Mhence it appeareth, that in case overseeing be taken for ruling, and feeding for teaching, this may be a sufficient reason, why these words feed the flock should be understood partitive, and not that other word overseeing; the one being (as by us both is granted) to be performed conjunctim, and the other divisim, though our Brethren too confidently say no reason can be given of it, which yet it seemeth they asterwards suspected might. And therefore in the latter end of their paper, they suggest this very reason to themselves, to which they there frame this Answer, which we doe here insert as comming in most fitly

in this place. Their Answer is this:

"That although Elders of a Congregation, though they doe it in Col"legio, and when they teach they doe it severally, yet both ruling
"and teaching are to be within the same compasse, in respect of
"them who are to be ruled and taught, &c. for when Elders rule
"one Congregation in Collegio, yet each of those Elders oversees
"and rules the whole flock, as truly as he can be said by teaching
"to feed that whole flock.

And so they make account it will make nothing for a Presbyteriall joynt ruling of them in a Classis, whom they doe not teach in a Congregation: To which our Answer is, that to this we have already answered in our Answers to their former Reasons, now with the Honourable Houses, in which we deale with that commensuration of ruling and teaching, which they there pleaded for; to which (that we may not assume agere) we refer them, and therefore say nothing more here to that Paragraph, and onely adde to this in hand.

6. That whereas towards the close of it, they aske, How doth this place (of the Alls) argue a Presbyteriall Government over many Congregations, if this overseeing and ruling be to be understood partitive? We answer, that Presbyteriall Government stands as well with partitive

governing, as partitive teaching, though not confined to it, for it grants the Elders a particular interest in their severall Congregations, by vertue of which they there govern partitive, viz. as to the Elders of other Congregations who have not there that particular interest and power: though that hindreth not, but that they may govern both them and the other Congregation conjunction with those other Elders in an Association, which is our Presbyteriall Government.

That of their Paper which remaines, is their Answer to what was faid in the Assembly, viz. that that feeding Alts 20. 28. might be understood partitive, because the same phrase used I Pet. 5.1. (feed the flock of God among you, taking the overfight thereof) must be understood partitive, because those Elders and beleevers to whom the Apostle Peter wrote, were scattered through Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bythinia, which could not all meet in one Congregation, to which they

give this answer,

"I. That in this place of Peter there are no such words, whereby the "relation of the whole flock is equally carried to all those Elders, as "there are in that speech of the Apostle to the Elders of Ephelus, " Acts 20. 28. Take heed to the Whole flock over which (whole flock) " the holy Ghost hath made you over feers.

"2. In this I Pet.5.1, 2. there are words which plainly point at such " a distribution, namely εν υμέν among you, applied both to the El-" ders and the flock. The Elders in Juiv among st you I exhort, feed " the flock, in univ, that is, each Elders feed the flock respectively,

"where ere they are among you in each Country.

"Therefore though it be understood partitive in Peter, yet it follows " not it should be so understood, Acts 20. 28.

To which first in generall we answer.

1. That when it was faid in the Affembly that that feeding the flock Acts 20. 28. might be understood partitive, it was said in reference to their feeding by teaching, and specially their ordinary fixt teaching in those severall fixt congregations, and so it was partitive : but by so saying we never meant that it was fimply and only partitive, as feeding contained all their office and duty in ruling as well as teaching, for so it might be, and was conjunctim, as of the Elders of a Congregation in their Confistory, so of associated Elders in a Classicall Presbytery. We dare not goe in this sense against the conjunction in the Acts, nor the partititive in Peter, which we averred, and therefore our Brethren need not have taken so much paines to prove; But we are for both in both places, that as in both places they did feed by teaching feverally, in their feverall Congregations, so they fed by ruling jointly in their united respective

spective Associations, so far as that Diagraces in Peter would admit. So that these two places, which our Brethren set at such an ods, may

for all this very well agree.

2. And especially if we looke into the expressions of both places, they seeme to looke very like Parallels, and so Interpreters make them, 43-so emaximus would be in Acts to moundained improve in Peter, and there a mosqueous in both places to be overseen and fed., and for Gode Church in the one place, there is Gods heritage in the other, though we must not dissemble, that the word is two nangews, in the plural number, which some expound of particular Congregations, which hath a shew of a better proof for the understanding of this of Peter partitive (which as even now we said, we deny not, but alleadge it for) then our Brethrens criticisme of en sque hall see when we come to it by and by. How ever, the places are so Parallel, that from a must be in the one, we may rationally infer at least a may be in the other. But our Brethren say no, in regard of the difference which they observe between those two places.

1. For first, they say that in the place of Peter, there are no such mords, whereby the relation of the whole slock is equally carryed to all those Elders, as there are in the place of Acts, Take heed to the whole slock, over which

[whole flock] the holy Ghost hath made you overseers.

We answer, 1. What ever the sense is, or the thing was, yet consider whether the words in the place of the Aets, which our Brethren infilt upon, do necessarily hold forth the relation of the whole flock, and that equally carried to all these Elders as our Brethren affirme, for the word is not one to working, which answers to our Brethrens Translation of it, the whole flock; which, to lay more weight on it, they repeat the second time, and put in a Parenthesis, the more to be taken notice of, but its warli To working, and that word, waili, we doubt not, but they know, doth not alwayes necessarily infer a collective sense, that it must needs be read ALL the flock as our Translators render it, or the whole flock, as our Brethren would. But that its taken oft-times di-Aributively, as wasar vosco nai wasar mananiar Mat. 4.23. 9. 35. & wasar inusery Acts 5. 42. 1 Thef. 5. 18. and so if it be read to every flock, over which the holy Ghost hath made you overseers, its taken partitive, and so all of them spoken together to feed their severall flocks in their severall divisions. And where's then that collective whole that our Brethren make account must necessarily be hence inferred? Suppose this should have been the meaning of Paul, to have said, I charge you all that you take heed to every flock, which severally God hath given you the overlight of: we ask whether that very sense might not have been

Pp 3

110 The Answer of the Assembly of Divines unto the Reasons of

expressed in these very words περσέχετε σαυτί τῷ σοιμνίφ, ἐν ῷ τὸ συεῦμα χρον ὑμᾶς દેલી ο ἐπισκόσες.

Or if it be said, it should then have been warn wouling, without the

Article 70, which makes it collective, and not distributive.

We say, its not so necessarily nor alwayes, especially when this τω, is answered by the Relative in a following: the Article, is without this observation sometimes left out, when the sense is collective, as I Pet. I. 24. Nay in one clause left out, and in another taken in, in the same sentence, and when spoken in the same sense was Ti μνέια, καὶ πάση διήσει, Phil. I. 3.

For the equall carrying of the relation of the whole flock to all those Elders which they mention, its nothing for them nor against us. For we say that the Elders in a Classis have an equal relation to the whole flock in their Association, as the Elders in a Consistory have to all the flock in their Congregation, and beside such a speech as that in Asts to feed the flocke, may be made to such as in any measure or degree have an interest in the feeding of their flock, to wit, in their severall capacities, year though they should not be equals.

2. Consider whether that be true, which they say that there is no such word in that place of *Peter*, whereby the relation of the whole flock is equally carried to all those Elders which be spoken to, and here we say,

T. If there be no word in Peter that expresseth that παντ which was in the Acts, yet it is necessarily to be understood when he saith ποιμαίνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον, he meanes πᾶν τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον, feed the flock of God among you, i. e. all (or the whole) flock of God among you, unlesse he would give leave that some part of the flock should be left unfed. Nay therefore

2. These words To en up to do hold out and expresse the whole flock, for some of the flock, or part of the flock, is not in propriety

of speech, but by a Trope, the flock.

2. But they fay positively that in Peter there are words which plainly point out such a distributive, viz. that in universe applied both to Elders and slock: and so he exhorts each Elders to feed the slock respectively, where there

are among them in each Country.

1. Then by their own interpretation, if it be understood partitive, yet not partitive of severall Congregations, and what then have they gained? But partitive of each Country, as they speak, and that will hold out Classicall, Synodicall, Provinciall or Nationall partitions, and so we may rather gain something by that bargaine.

2. That pointing out such a distribution by that double a vinit, is not

fo plaine either to us, or in it felfe, as our Brethren would make it.

is no fuch thing, & therfore, not plainly pointed out, and yet let indifferent readers judge whether των σεεσωντέρει εν υμίν in Peter do more plainly point out a distribution, then σεεσωντέρει εν υμίν in Peter do more plainly point out a distribution, then σεεσωντέρει εν υμίν in Peter do more plainly point out a distribution, then σεεσωντέρει εν εκκλησίας Acts 20. 17. especially as our Brethren interpret that for one Congregationall Church. Or whether το σοίμνιον εν υμίν the flock of God amongst you, be more distributive, or rather not all one, as to this purpose, with των σοιμνίω εν ων υμάς το συνείμα το άριον έθειο επεκίσεις over which the holy Ghost made you overseers, and this the rather,

2. If we consider that phrase en univ singly by it selfe, in which we can find no ground of our Brethrens Criticisme that it should so plainly point out such a distribution as they plead for, for it plainly points out what it plainly signifies, and that is, in you or among you, and let all judge

whether such an expression then, may not be used.

1. Where there is no such distribution as our Brethren mean, namely, into several Congregations. For it may be said of one individual Congregation. As suppose in Tarmouth, where but one Congregation, and there divers Elders, a Minister from some other parts may properly write. I exhort the Elders ev vuir to feed that slock of God, ev vuir.

2. Where there are such distributions, but as collectively knit together in a joynt association and Government: as in case one should have said to the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem, ποιμαίνείε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον, it had been a most proper and sensible speech, for they did ποιμαίνεν τὸ ἐν ἀυδοῖς ποίμνιον, all the severall divisions in Jerusalem, yea of all Israel appealing to them: and yet its well known they never governed partitive but conjunctim as an highest Nationall Synod or Assembly.

And thus far in Answer to what our Brethren have said against the first Proposition of our argument, for many Congregations under one Presbyterial Government, viz. that the multitude of beleevers there, did make more Congregations then one. Our Brethren adde in

the close of all.

As for the second and third, that there were many Elders over that people as one flocke, and one Church, and that they did govern this one flock, the former proposition not being proved, they make nothing to the proof of that conclusion, &c.

To which we fay onely two things.

1. That if the former Proposition (of more beleevers at Ephesiss then could meet in one Congregation) had not been proved, yet this second of many more Elders being there then could have been imployed in one Congregation, might of it self have made something to the proof

Proof of the conclusion, of many Congregations under one Presbyteriall Government.

For those many Elders might have argued several Congregations, which they might have been divided into, for convenience of habitation, and for preventing of many and great inconveniences in that Idolatrous and heathenish City, and those times of Persecution, which might possibly, nay probably have come to passe, if they had all met in one place, though they had been no more, then might have possibly met altogether in one Congregation.

2. But what if that proposition hath been proved, and our Brethrens objections against it answered, as (we hope they are) then it so joyned with the other two following propositions might make enough for the proof of the maine conclusion: That many Congregations may be

under one Presbyteriall Government.

Concordat cum Originali.

Adoniram Byfield, Scriba.

ARGU-

## ARGVMENTS

OF THE

DISSENTING BRETHREN

AGAINST THE

SUBORDINATION

OF

STANDING SYNODS,

PROVINCIALL,

NATIONALL,

OECUMENICAL,

AS

7 URIDICALL, Ecclesiasticall COURTS.



LONDON, Printed for Humphrey Harward. 1648.

## Propositions of the Assembly, concerning Synods.

1. The Scripture doth hold out another fort of Assemblies, for the Government of the Church, besides Classicall and Congregationall, which we sall Synodicall, Act. 15.

2. Synodicall Assemblies may lawfully be of severall sorts: as

Provinciall, Nationall, and Oecumenicall.

3. It is lawfull and agreeable to the word of God, that there be a Subordination of Congregationall, Classicall, Provinciall, and Nationall Assemblies: that so appeales may be made from the inferiour to the superiour, respectively. Proved from Mat. 18. which holding forth the Subordination of an offending Brother, to a particular Church, it doth also, by a parity of reason hold forth the Subordination of a Congregation to superiour Assemblies.

And it is agreeable to the light of nature, that he who is wronged, and deprived of his right by one power, should have recourse to another power, which may restore unto him his right againe, and rescind the sentence, by which he was wronged: else there would be no powerfull remedy

provided to remove wrong, and to preserve right.

To the latter Proposition about the Subordinations of Synods, the dissenting Brethren entred their dissent, after the debate, and their Reasons in writing, as followeth.

1-11-11 11 11-7

# ARGUMENTS

## OF THE DISSENTING BRETHREN, Against the Subordination of Synods, &c.

Lthough we judge Synods to be of great use, for the finding out, and declaring of Truth in difficult cases, and encouragement to walk in the Truth; For the healing offences; and to give advice unto the Magiastrate, in matters of Religion: And although we give great honour and conscientious respect, unto their determinations. Yet seeing the Proposition holds

forth, Not onely an Occasionall, but a standing use of them; and that in Subordination of one unto another, as furidicall, Ecclesiasticall Courts; and this in all cases: we humbly present these REASONS against it.

First Argument.

A LL such subordinations of Courts, having greater and lesser degrees of power, to which in their order, Causes are to be brought, must have the greatest and most expresse marrant and designment for them in the word. Whence it is argued thus.

Those Courts that must have the most expresse Warrant and Designment for them in the word, and have not; their power is to be suspected, and not erected in the Church of God.

But these ought to have so: And have not.

Therefore, &c.

The first Part of the Minor is thus proved.

There ought to be the greatest and most expresse warrant, and that for two things belonging to them. First, for their Subordination & Number. Secondly, for their Bounds and limits of Power. And because this principle is made use of, both in the point in hand, and other

. 0

of like nature, viz. to argue, à pari ratione, from Like and parallel Reason, the argument to establish this Proposition, shall proceed accordingly, from the strength of like reason in other cases & instances: That There Ought To Be A Warrant And Designment For Them In The Word.

1. From like reason in the case of subordination of Officers in the Church, one over another: there was a special institution, and it is required, or we owne them not; and that for intensive power, and extensive power: and therefore for the subordination of such Courts also. The Rule of Proportion holds: For a Government of and by severall subordinations, whether of one Church officer or person over another, and of him over others, or of a many in the like degree of subordination, are but severall forms of Government, of which there is the like reason in common; As of Subordinations in a Monarchicall way, wherein still but some one person is superiour to another downwards; or in an Aristocraticall way throughout, in this they come all to one, that if there be to be, an institution or warrant for the one, there is to be for the other; whether God or men be, to be the Institutors of them. Now in the government of the Church, for the subordination of Office Rs, there was an expresse Institution, or men ought not to have assumed it. I Cor. 12. 28. God hath set in his Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets and Evangelists (who were of a parallel order) thirdly Teachers: and the difference of power in Apostles and Evangelists is by subordination: But Christ hath not set the like subordination of Courts.

2 It is proved from what the Presbyteriall principles themselves reject. An institution is required by them in the case of subordination of Bishops, Archbishops, Popes, in their arguing against them and their power. Yea and by the Episcopall Writers themselves, who when it is objected, that if there may be a Bishop, and an Archbishop over him, why not a Patriarch over Archbishops, and a Pope over all? They deny this, and reject a Patriarch or Pope (although with renouncing of infallibility) as not warranted by the word. They fay an higher and more univerfall subordination, alters the case. And the usual exception against this subordination of Church governours is, that in Scripture we read neither of the name of an Archbishop, nor the thing; and therefore not of a subordination of them. The like may be said of these, where read we of Councels Provinciall, Nationall, names or things? Yea, and in this way of arguing (in this respect) the disadvantage is on this side rather: for we are sure that once, there was in the Church, such a subordination in Church officers, Evangelists over Pastors, Apostles over Evangelists (only they were extraordinary, and so no patterns) but of such a subordi-

nation

nation of Councels in an Arifocraticall way, there is nothing to be found.

. 3. It is argued from like and just reason in other societies, and bodies politick. In all Kingdomes and Common-wealths well ordered and constituted, there is and ought to be a set and expresse order by the Lawes, both of the number and bounds of Courts of Judicatory, from whom and to whom Appeals are made, and in what cases &c. And that this subordination should be set forth and fixed by the Law, is as necessary, as the Lawes or rules by which men in a Kingdome are to be governed. The wisdome of the Law doth judge it not enough to appoint severall Sorts of Officers, as to say Councellors, Sergeants, Judges; but designeth also and appoints severall Courts with their power and bounds; The designment of which, especially of standing Courts, (being made up of these) is a matter of much more moment then the other. Yea and still the greater and higher such Courts and Assemblies are, having amplitude of power over others, the more expresse evidence and warrant for their power there is, and ought to be: as for Parliamentary power, and the prisviledges thereof.

And this is evident, as from the examples of all Kingdomes, fo from what the Scripture speakes of the constitution of them; each part of the subordination of such power in all Government, both is, and also was called a Creation of men, in things humane, whether it be in a Monarchicall or Aristocraticall way, 1 Pet. 2.13. Submit your sebves to every bamane creation, ar govern alizes, and he speakes there evidently of (and therefore thus stileth) the subordination of powers in a Commonwealth, whether Officers or Courts: for it follows, whether unto the King as Supreame, or unto Governours, as those that are sent by him, &c. and so here subordination of power under him. Now parallel, spirituall and Ecclesiasticall government, with this. As in the rearing an humane fabrick and contignation of power, There must be an ordinance, or creation from man, when God hath left the framing of it unto him (as in this case he hath) So this subordination, being in Divine power, there must be a Divine inflitution for it, besides that of the distinction of the officers themselves.

4. It is argued from like reason with Christs institution, Mat. 18. If in a particular Church, Christ hath prescribed the Jeverall subordinations of proceedings, and let forth the degrees, bounds and order of them; then much more it is required in these; by how much a larger extent of power is committed to them. The first rule in Mat. 18. is, If thy brother offend thee, tell him thy selfe; then 2. Take two or three, and if he hear not them, then 3. Tell the Church. If there were a thousand brethren in a

Congre-

Congregation, a man were not bound, nor were it orderly, in an ordinary and set way, to take, as the Church shall please, first two or three, and then ten, and then twenty, and still the like proportion of a greater number, ere he comes to the Church it felfe: but Christ hath set the order, and his wisedome saw it meet, thus to designe and limit the proceedings in a particular Church: And it had been much more necessary to have appointed the like, about these generall and greater Assemblies; because every one of these Courts (intended) have the power of a sentence and judgement, whereas those two or three proceed but in a way of admonitions, in order to a superiour Court. Shall Christ take care for Congregations (which are esteemed the meanest) and not for these? Of which, if Christ should not have set the bounds of power and subordination thereof, none would know what belongs to them; who is in fault, if offences be not corrected; nor would any know whom first to appeale unto. I will appeale unto the Nationall Assembly first, (aies one, and am not bound to the Classicall or Provinciall; Another would say, I will appeale to a Generall Councell, which can best judge, and will be sure to make an end of it. Why should any be hindered for going Per saltum, if Christ hath not fet forth, and obliged us to these subordinations, in their order?

5. In the Church of the Jewes: The subordinations that were, were set forth and determined by Institution or example; how many Courts there should be, and where to rest: There were the Courts of the Cities, and the Townes; and then their Sanedrim to which the case was to be carried, if it were too hard for their particular Courts: and no other Courts, between, appointed. Deut. 17. In the new Testament we have for removing scandals, a Congregational standing Court and government (or be it a Classicall standing Presbytery over many Congregations as our Brethren fay) and we have an example also of going out from a particular standing Church, (whether the one or the other) electively, to another Church or Churches, when divisions are therein (which Atts 15. holds forth) but still, for such standing subordinations and Courts as these, out of the Church, nothing at all. If there had been any Nationall Sanedrin, a fet and constant Judicatory, then Christ would have appointed it, as he had done before; But HE HATH NOT; no example, no Institution helds it forth. Which is

### The second part of the Minor Proposition. Thus proved.

1. The new Testament is silent in it. And if it be said, that all Nations were not then converted, when the Apostles wrote. It is answered

that

that God in the old Testament tooke care to set the order aforehand, when they had no Cities, nor were setled in the land. And accordingly if the Apostles had not lived to see that which might occasion such an institution or precept, yet they would some way have left order, for time to come.

But 2. though the Apostles lived to see, many famous particular Churches erected in a Province, as well as in Cities; in a Nation, as in Judea; in Asia, in Creete, there were many Cities and Churches in each: and although all the people in these Countries were not Christians nor members of Churches, yet there was matter for the moulding and casting them into these subordinations, as well as now in France. where not the third part are Protestants, or in the Low-countries, where not the tenth part of the inhabitants are members of their Churches. And fure if these superstructions had been so absolutely necessary in the Government of the Churches, it had been as necessary to have appointed them. They fet up and appointed all needfull remedies for ordering the Churches after them, when they should be gone. And 'tis more france, that in the case of the spreading of errours, they should not write to Churches as gathered into Synods, and as having the standing power to prevent and suppresse them (if such ordinary standing Assemblies armed with coercive power had been then, in that existence, as now) that upon no occasion, this should be done, when yet they had occasions. Take the seven Churches in Asia, Ephesus, Thyatira, Smyrna, &c. with the rest of the Churches therein, a PROVINCE, and though therein we finde many great disorders, and some in Dostrine (the more proper work of these standing Synods) yet we see that Christ writes, onely, to each of those Churches apart, and reproves each, for their disorder, in each: whereas had they been one Church, in such a standing association for government, and had had ordinary Provinciall and Nationall Assemblies extant, as now, the reproof would have been especially directed thereunto. As if errours and disorders were in the Classical Churches (as those all are pretended to be) of Scotland, the chief rebuke would now more justly fall upon the Nationall and Provincicall Assemblies, as their constitution is.

Yea thirdly, the holy Ghost would have at least vouchsafed to these, or some other Churches (that were in like manner, in a Nation, or Province, as Galatia, &c.) in respect of such a combination, the name of a Church, who must (according to the principles of this government) have had so much of the power of a Church. But no where are the Churches in a Province, called a Church, but Churches in the plurall: And if the lesser Churches, then these; yea rather these, having most of the power, should

should therefore, have had most of the name; Yea, and by how much the Church power thereof, should have been most independent (as a Nation is) and so come, most eminently, within that rule, Tell the Church (from which words these pretend their power, and yet cannot shew so much title therete, as to have the name Church given them) Let a rationall account be given of this.

#### Second Argument.

If there be such a Subordination of Synods in the Church of Christ, then there is no Independency but in an OE CUMENICALL COUNCELL.

Which first, Would bring in a forraigne Ecclesiasticall power over each

State and Kingdome.

And secondly: Therefore of all other should have its designation and existence, in the Word; and is more needfull, then the other two forts of Synods mentioned: For if any should be extant, then that, which is REMEDIUM EFFICACISSIMUM. Tis faid, there is wanting Remedium efficax, if these subordinations be not; but according to these principles there is wanting that, which is the most efficacious remedy, if a Generall Councell be not extant in the world. For if there be not a resting in a Classicall Presbytery, but Provincial also must be, and appealed to: neither are they reckoned efficacious enough, but there must be Wational alfo, (upon this supposition, that the greater Assembly hath more of the promise and assistance of Christ than the lesser, then of all other a GENERALL COUNCELL must be supposed in a transcendent manner, above all the rest, to have the promise of assistance made to it : and so to be the most eminently efficacious, (if not the onely remedy) on earth, yea and onely to be rested in, being that which onely is the ultimate. Some of the Papifts they gave this to such a Generall Councel, that it cannot erre, but according to these principles of Presbyteriall Divines. though it might erre, yet it is supposeable to be transcendantly more infallible then all the other under it; & God more with it then with all the rest: And therefore God in his word would have given especially order for this, above all other. And the same God that suits his providences to his institutions, would not have failed, in what is the most soveraigne remedie of all other, that it might have been existent in all ages: as we see his promise was to the fewes, to keep their land, when the males thrice a year, went up to the Generall Affembly at ferusalem. But 300. years the Churches wanted them, and could not enjoy them; and they were judged therefore not necessary to the government of the Church, which vet (according to these principles) must have been the most necessary of all the ref.

Yea, and further also, Thirdly, there must be an injurious Independency fet up in a Nationall Synod: for when a man hath appealed from one Court to another, and comes to this Nationall, that is the Ultimate existent; and upon the sentence thereof, comes next to be hanisht out of a Nation, to have his estate forfested, to the ruine of himself and posterity: Then it is, that he most of all needs the relief of an higher Remedy, more efficacious than all these, he hath gone through, if such an one may be; Yet then he is left remedilesse, and he (according unto these Principles) left more unsatisfied then ever; because thinks he, there is by Gods appointment, a Court that hath more of God, and of Christin it, than all these, to judge of the Truth and Right, and Loe It Is Not; and can never be expected.

Let it be withall considered, that when God appointed a Subordination of standing Courts; he withall designed out, which should be the Supreame, and made it the Ultimate; and the Supreamacy, and Independency of it, in a set and standing way, was his institution, as much as the appointment of the Court it selfe: So that he was to be put to death, that obeyed not the sentence of it, and all Appeales were thereby cut off. Therefore if a Nationall Church doth take upon it, to be an Independent Church, upon the sentence thereof, to have the extreamest punishment executed, (but that of death) that in a Nation men are capable of; it had need, for the quieting of all mens Spirits that must submit to it; not onely shew a warrant from God, for it to be an Ecclesiasticall Judicatory, but also to be the Supreame Court, as the Sanedrim was, that Appeals

should be made to.

#### Third Argument.

To that end, let it be examined, what set rules there is, or may be supposed to be of these subordinations, and their bounds; and the Ultimate Independency in a Nationall Church: which should be fetcht from some standing considerations, which the word warrants; God never having constituted a Church, but he gave the bounds thereof. All variation of Church power is from God: The alteration of the government of his people the Jewes, from samily government (which had been under the Law of Nature) to Nationall, in Moses his time, was by expresse appointment: And as himself made and constituted it a Nationall Church, so there was an Ecclesiasticall government framed by himself suited thereunto. And in the New Testament there is a Reed to measure the Temple. Revel. i.i.

A rule to set out the limits of Church-power, as well as under the old; and therefore the argument is framed thus.

Rr

I.

That Church-power which cannot shew a constant Divine rule for its variation, and subordination, and Ultimate Independency, is not of God, and so may not be.

But this variation of Church-power into these subordinations, cannot shew any such steady and constant rule for these things. Therefore &c.

The Major is evident from what hath been said.

The Minor is made good by a removall of all particulars, that, may be supposed to be the square of framing these subordinations, &c.

1. Not that rule, That the greater number or company of Churches should rule the lesse, and that the whole should rule the part. For

then,

1. There would be as many severall subordinations as there can be supposed variations of greater numbers; and that will arise to more than these three onely; Every new greater company would constitute a new Synod.

2. Where is the promise of God, that he will be more with the greatest part of them that professe Christianity, rather than with a few, so farre as to constitute a new power and government?

Yea,

3. The greater number of Churches professing Religion, are more corrupted; the purer Churches are fewer. It had been ill for Philadelphia and the Angell and Elders thereof, if those seven Churches in Asia had been cast into such a subordinate association for government, to be exercised by the Angels and Elders of all the other six Churches, with the rest in Asia. And the like may be said of the purer Reformed Churches in Germany; if the greater number of those, that yet were true Churches, should have ruled the lesser, then the Lutherans and Calvinists being bound to this government, the Lutherans being also true Churches, and the more in number, would by virtue of this Lam, have soon corrupted the purer. And what reason can be pretented, (according to this rule, and the principles of this government) to leave any true Churches out of an association?

4. Suppose there should be as many Elders, and Churches more purely reformed, in one province, or shire then in the rest of a whole Nation besides, (as instance might be given, in some of the reformed Churches, that there are) why should not God be thought to be as much with them, as with the Nationall Assembly? And if all are to give themselves up to this law, how will the greater which is the worse, either corrupt the purer or oppresse

them?

5. If qua greater; then the decrees of greater, viz. Generall Conneels, in former ages, should bind us more then Nationall or Provinciall now: for they should have had more of Church in them, by this rule, and so more of Christ: And then all Generall Councels, that set up Popes and Bishops, and all other superstitions, are still binding.

If it be said, we chose them not. Yet still that is not the ground makes their decrees lesse Divine or obliging to us, but it lieth in the authority of Gods ordinance, that they were the greater and more generall Councels. And how ever still, if this be the rule, that the greater number of Churches rule the lesse; then take the measure of this greatnesse and number of Churches from Time, Atretching the line over all ages past, as well as from the more number of Churches in such or such a place, or Nations in the present times: and so looke what generall Councels for most ages of the world did establish, should by vertue of this Law, oblige the present times, and have more force upon us, then the universall Church in this present age; much more then of any Nationall Assembly, if either be simply considered under a meer Ecclesiasticall obligation, that is, qua greater and more of Church. Time varieth not the case: fo:but that all their acts, having been acts, of the Church universall, in all ages should, comparatively, stand more in force. The acts of any the last general Councels, will stand in force, untill a general Councell of like extent repeale those acts; as the Statutes of Parliament of our Ancestors doe, if not repealed, by like and equal authority.

Secondly, it is not the notion or consideration of their being Churches in such or such a Nation or Province, that can be the rule of making this obligation or setting of these bounds. It must be considered the Question is of a meere Ecclesiastique obligation by vertue of Church principles, such as should have been a justrule and measure to the primitive Churches, sere Princes turned Christian) to have reared up the like subordinations. Now then the limits from hence must either rise from being sirft one Church in a Kingdome under the same civil Government; Or secondly, one Church in a Nation; that is, either from a National respect or Politicall.

First in generall from neither; For that instance, Asts 15. of the Councell there, its rise or the bounds of its authority was founded upon neither: For if either Nationall or Politicall respects, should have obliged them, they should have sent to Syria, and Cilicia, and not to ferusalem, who were both under a differing Government civill, and of another Nation.

But more particularly.

II.

First not qua Church in one Kingdome, for that is per accident to a Church, that it growes up to a Kingdome, or that the whole Nation is converted to Christianity: And therefore a set rule for all times cannot be fetcht from hence; this could not be the certaine measure of the

Independency of Church power in the Apostles times.

Secondly, this makes the bounds of Ecclefiastical Independency and jurisdiction uncertaine, varying as the bounds of Kingdomes doe vary. When the Romane Empire, had all Kingdomes under it, all the Churches must then, have been obliged to have had generall standing Councels fuited to the extent of the Empire, to have been the next unto the Provinciall, fuch as the Nationall are now to the Provinciall; or elfe before the Empire turned Christian, there was by this rule even as many independencies as Churches. And then againe, when this Empire was broken into ten Kingdomes, yea and many moe, there arose instead of the former, many new Independent boundaries of Church-power (of which only the question is, and not of that power, which a Church doth come to have, and simply and alone holds of the Magistrates, which will be meerly Civill) And then as Kingdomes vary by conquests, the like alteration the bounds of Church power must receive. Among the fewes it did not, for when the Church was broken into two Kingdomes by Gods appointment; yet the Church state, by Gods institution, varied not. but was still one Church. All these things are therefore meer accidentals to Church power, and how can they be the foundation of the bounds of it?

III.

Lastly, if this Independency ariseth from the Magistrates: Then, there is no need of such subordinations; which is proved by experience in Reformed Churches abroad; who are well enough governed, without these subordinations. Geneva hath no Appeals, yet is governed but by one Classicall Church: And why may not all other Churches be governed as well without them, if the Magistrate oversees them, and keeps each to their duties? The Churches in the Low-Countries want Nationall Synods, and yet are peaceably governed: yea, some for a long time are without provinciall, and say if they can, they will never have more; and yet are peaceably and quietly governed: It is as the Civill-Magistrate will terminate the Independency, and himselfe over-look it. Or,

ШІ.

Secondly, if these bounds be fetcht from Nationall respects. Then 1. in Germany, Calvinists must subject to the greater number of Lutherans; and in this Kingdome, all Ministers must make up this association, and the greater number will be the worser, and maligne and oppose the good. If because the Calvinists professe a further reformation, they are disobliged from associating with the Lutherans, then those, in any Na-

tion that professe a further reformation than others, are free by the same Law also. Surely Uniformity of principles is a more intimate bond of such association than any such outward extrinsecall respects. 2. If qua Nation, or principality, then wales must be Independent. 3. If qua Nation, then if nation be taken for a people of the same tongue and kindred, then all the Christian sewes in the primitive times, when scattered into a Nation, were bound to have made one Church distinct from all the Churches they cohabited with: If Nation be taken for a people dwelling in the same Nationall bounds, then the same fewes being dispersed into several Countries and Nations, must have made one Church with the severall Nations where they lived; whereas Peter in his Epistles, and James in his, and Paul to the Hebrewes, write unto the Jewes apart, as Churches in all Nations.

#### Fourth Argument.

That government which necessarily produceth representations of spirituall power, out of other representations, with a derived power therefrom, there is no warrant for.

But these subordinations of Synods, Provinciall, Nationall, Occumeni-

call, for the government of the Church, due fo.

The Major shall be spoken to, after the MINOR Proposition is both cleared and proved, which is done by putting two things together.

First, that if there be an authoritative subordination of all Churches in the Provinces to a Nationall Assembly, and so of many Nations to an Occumenicall, binding unto subjection; that then all, in the Provinces must be interested in that Nationall, & all in the Nation in that Occumenicall; so as it may be said, that they are all involved and included, and so obliged; as it is in Parliamentary power, wherein the Shires are involved.

Secondly, that this interest, in this subordination cannot arise, but either by immediate choice of those Elders, which shall represent each Church and Congregation imediately, (which is the case of our Parliament men chosen imediately by those they represent) or else, that the Provinciall Elders, sent by the Congregations, shall choose out of themselves, some few, that shall represent the Provinces, and so likewise the Nationall Assemblies shall choose out some few, which shall represent the whole Nation in a generall Councell. Now the first of these is not, nor can be, in the choice of a National Assembly. Congregations meet not, for any such imediate choice, but the Elders of them, all

Rr 3 choose

choose out of themselves; So as the obligation of all the Churches to be subject to a Nationall Assembly (arising out of those other subordinations) is not, because they are a greater number of Elders or Divines, (for in a Provinciall Synod there may be assembled as many as in the Nationall) but it ariseth from hence, that some out of all, doe represent the rest: And if they did not meet and Vote, as representers of the whole, then when a Nationall Assembly sits in a great City, all other neighbour Ministers might come and Vote with them, and out-Vote them, who are the representers of the whole.

Major.

Now that such a representation having a derived spiritual sower from other representations, is not in matters Spiritual, warrantable. Besides, all arguments against delegated power in matters Spiritual, all Ministers being imediately Christi Vicarii: & that all such representations grow weaker, as reflexions use to doe; Elders represent the Churches, in Classicall and Provinciall Assemblies, as being imediately chosen by them, but the Elders in Nationall Assemblies, are the representations of Elders in Provinces, and so are a shadow of that first shadow; whereas yet, they have the most of power, even all that can be supposed to belong to the whole

substance. Besides such considerations, it is argued thus.

1. If these few out of Nations, in a generall Councell should bind all those Nations in matters spirituall, and a few out of Provinces the Nation, they must be supposed to have the promise, and an assistance answerable. But where is either the promise, or can gifts in a few be suppofed to produce such an obligation? Tis true, where two or three are gathered together, His promise is to be in the midst of them, and so suppose with more, when more are met; But that his promise should be, to be with a few out of a Nation, as with the whole Nation; and those not chosen imediately by the Nation, and but the Representers of them, cannot be expected. Tis granted, that each fo met, hath the gifts and affistance of an Elder, and so the whole as of so many Elders, met (as me in this Assembly, met together, are to be lookt upon, and the judgements thereof accordingly reverenced) but that as they are Elders representative of hundreds of other Elders, who themselves are Representers of Churches, that any such addition should arise to them, by virtue of this dutlicated representation, over and above what is in their single gifts and office. Let either a warrant be produced or a promise. Two things are allowed them, but a third denyed them. First, it is granted, they may have affistance to judge as Elders, which is their office. Secondly, affistance to judge according toutheir personall abilities, being thus called to give their advice. But thirdly, such a superadded assistance as holds

proportion, to that spiritual bulk, and body which they irepresent is denied them: for suppose, that alwayes it falls out, that the best and choycest of a Nation are chosen; yet still not to hold porportion to the whole Nation, there must be more than an ordinary promise for it; and therefore had need be expresse and evident. When the Jesuits say, that the Pope may erre, as Persona privata; but not as Pontifex, when he is in his chaire, representing the whole Church; Davenant confutes them De Fudice thus, Officium dat Authoritatem judicandi, sed privata persona conditio- & Normi nes, dant modum & facultatem. That it is otherwise in Common-wealths, fidei Pref: is, because they being humane creations, the represented can fet up a power, which shall represent them: But this power we speak of, is supernaturall, and must be from God, and his institution. The Sanedrim of Hierusalem, had a speciall assistance above all Courts else; and therefore God appointed Causes to be brought to it; which speciall assistance is intimated, twice in the institution of it. Deut. 17. by this, That they should go up to the place which God shall choose, Ver. 8. And do according to the Sentence which they of that place (which the Lord shall choose) shall then thee. An emphasis is put upon that blessing, which by Gods choice and election, did accompany that place, which God had chosen to put his Name, and promised to be in an eminent manner, present in ; and to accept their Sacrifices there offered, (which was a representative wor-(hip of that Nation) and not elsewhere. Now, as it was the representative worship of the Nation, so these Governours were the representative Governours of the Nation; and both fanclified in that place, as the gift was by the Altar, as that which God had chosen. If the like institution were found with the intimation of such a bleffing from a peculiar choice of Gods, of Nationall Assemblies, all ought to subject to them, in matters spirituall.

2. If there be such representations as these, in one or few persons of many Churches, they have each for that time, whilst in such an Assembly, Archiepiscopall and Episcopall power; and their case is parallel (parallel then, as for that time and occasion, and as met in a Synod) with that of so many Bishops met in a Councell; whose Episcopall power as then, and therein met, lies in this, that they are so many Churches representative: Especially this would fall out, if these Synods should still consist of the Same men, or if some few should be alwayes chosen to them. And why may there not be standing persons that are more skilfull in such affaires. through exercise, as well as standing Assemblies themselves? And then as touching matters of furifdiction, in such an Assembly, they are for

the present, the same with so many Bishops met in a Convocation.

3. If these representations having the power of all the Churches in

the Nation, were warrantable, they mult BE A CHURCH. Now besides, that they are no where so called: & if they were called so, then they
are a body to Christ; for so every Church is; and where is Christ said
to have a representative Body, of his Body? They are a company of Elders personally gathered, but a representative Church they are not, nor can
be; and yet must be, or they have not the power of all the Churches in
a Nation in them, nor otherwise doe their acts oblige them to subjection.

Reasons against the allegation of Acts 15. for the Subordination of Synods, Provinciall, Nationall, Occumenicall.

Besides, what hath been said against this example, alledged to prove Presbyteriall Asts of Government, by the Elders of the Church of Hiernsalem, in the Reasons formerly presented; proving first, that this one example cannot serve to prove both the Presbyterial Government and Synodicall; but that if the Reverend Assembly will lean to the one, the other must be quitted And secondly, that that Assembly was not a formall Synod, but onely a reference, by the particular Church of Antioch of their differences among themselves, unto this particular Church of Hiernsalem and no other: It may be moreover observed, that the example of it, is here surther extended, to prove all sorts of Synods and Subordinations thereof; both Provinciall, Nationall, and Occumenicall; and so it must suite all these so great varieties, whereas it is not suffer for

any one of them.

But if it had been a Synod. Yet 1. Neither Provinciall, nor Nationall, for Antioch consults not with the Churches of her owne Nation, but seeks to Hierusalem, a Church of, Judea of another Nation, and another Province. Neither 2. Is it the instance of a standing Synod, (which the word Subordination in the proposition, doth necessarily inferre, or else the links of those chaines will not hang together) but elective; for they sent out of election, and choice to them, and to them but about this one Question, at this time, without any obligation to referre all other matters to them in an ordinary way. Nor 3. Was there a multiplication of Synods, but onely one, in whose judgement those of Antioch rested. 4. Much lesse is it the instance, of rearing up of a subordination and contignation of Synods, superiour and inferiour; which is a faither thing; For though, when offences are not healed, and one reference to other Churches, is not sufficient to cure them; there should

be

be a seeking to others, yet the example obligeth the Churches that are in difference, not to take and choose the Churches of that Province; either as of that Province, or as the greater number, to whom both those among whom the controversie is, & these, to whom it was afore referred, must be subordinately subject. Much lesse doth it hold forth, that the Churches of that Province, may judicially challenge a right of authority, to decide it, and oblige them Subpana to their determination; and then, the Churches of that whole Nation challenge the like over all. But still it runs in this way onely; that those who shall be judged meetest and ablest, and faithfulest to determine and compose it, by those who are to refer it, shall have the hearing of it.

The Argument of the Reverend Assembly was drawne from like reafor, and let there be found like reason, and it is granted: And thoughthe instance is not the pattern of a formall Synod; yet it holds forth this rule of equity, that when offences arise among Churches, references ought to be made, from out of themselves to Churches abroad to heal them. But the question is, to what Churches these references are to be made, and how? (Let the like reason held forth in the example, be kept unto, and decide it) Say we still, to those Churches, the Churches offended or divided shall choose as fittest and ablest to determine it. This is clear in the example, Antioch was not bound to refer it to the Church of ferufalem, as greater, or as a neighbour Church, or of the same Province, but as best able to judge of the differences. And this way ageces with the Law of Nature, and of arbitration, so usuall amongst men, which God hath there, set up as an ordinance, and patterne of proceeding in such Cases: But this Subordination of Synods, the Proposition intends, holds so differing a course from this, As first, instead of Elective Synods and occasionall, it sets up standing and set, to be the Judge of the Churches under them for ever. Secondly, not in one case (as Antioch to Ferusalem) but in all cases, whatever shall fall out. Thirdly, not in a way of multiplication or diversification, as need shall be; but of subordination and setled superiority; And the grounds of this to be, because the greatest must rule the leffe: and that they are neighbour Churches in the same Province or Nation. And this, Alls 15. is so farre from countenancing by a Par ratio, that in all things it is unlike: and fo, there is a differing tonstitution and rule of these Synods thus subordinate, and what the reason drawne from Acts 15. will warrant. And therefore doth make a differing formall reason in the Government.

And HUMANE PRUDENCE added, wil not rectific it; when the reafon of the institution is so much varied from. For instance, If the fundamentall Law, for remedy of wrongs, and deciding controversies in any Kingdome, were by arbitration elective, to take them to be their judges. whom the parties in difference judge aptest, every way, for the present controversie; & that the Precedents & ruled cases hold forth no more: And if the government of another Kingdom were, that the greater should rule and determine the causes of the lesse; and according to the proportion thereof, to have subordinate standing Courts erected, to which (by appeal from one to the other) all causes should be brought: Whether were not these two, such differing frames of Government, so as, that he, that would mould the first to the second, might not be challenged to fet up a new Government, differing from the fundamentall Law of that Kingdome: And whether the first is not a liberty to be stood upon. against the second, if it were vouchsafed to any Kingdome, (and that is the case here) is humbly submitted.

And the bounds of fuch Affemblies elective, need no fet or standing rule: because they arise from emergent occasions, in cases of controversie and offence; and the extent of them, And so the condition and nature of the things themselves, doe hold forth their own rise: like as the bounds of particular Congregations to be of such, as live so, as conveniently to meet in one place, ariseth from the nature of the thing it selfe, and the

necessary requisites thereunto.

## Reasons against the Argument, drawne from the Analogie of Matthew 18.

1. The strength of the Argument runs, that because there should be this remedy, that therefore, there is such a remedy.

2. Tis granted, there is a remedy: which is a going forth to other Churches, which Alts 15. holds forth: But that, excommunication (which is the remedy held forth, Mat. 18.) of the offending Church or Churches should be the remedy, is not there held forth, as hath been shewn. There is remedy of Coordination, such as between two Nations, and as between Pares, as Churches are, proceeding in a way fuitable to their condition: but not this of subordination, that the greater number of Churches should become standing Courts, and have power to excommunicate the lesser: But that all Churches have a power to Declare the offence, and withdraw the communion from those Churches. And in reason, how is it posfible for a Nationall Church to excommunicate all the Churches of a Province? And how ineffectuall would that be? Or for a Generall Councell to excommunicate a Nation? And if they cannot use this Remedy: to what end is this subordination of Synods, having this Authority please ded for ? And

I.

And whereas tis said, that there must be the same Remedy, that is in a Congregation, for an offending brother; or else where the disease is strongest,

the remedy is meakest. It is answered,

First, that where the disease is strongest, there, this, which is called the firongest remedy, cannot be applyed; or with an apparent inefficaciousnesse. For, when the Churches in a Province erre, or a Nationall Church, here the disease is strongest; and yet it would be in vain, to interdict them, communion among themselves, or deliver them unto Satan. Yea, when it comes to the highest, namely, a Nationall Assembly, wherein (if erring) the disease is greatest and strongest; there is not onely no remedy, but the highest and greatest power to doe hurt, upon all under them: As when the generality of the Clergy were Arians. And if they erre, the Errour is worse than of a Popes erring, or a Bishops: he is but one, and may be deposed. And in the greater bodies of the Clergie, the greater part are, and have been still the worser, and more corrupt; as is apparent in this Kingdome at present; in which, by virtue of the Presbyteriall principles, all Ministers must be taken in: and if you will put them out, where will others be had in their roome? Convert men we cannot; and if not converted, Ministers, of all others, are the worlt and greatest opposites to Religion. And if a Nationall Assembly be chosen by these, the greater number are like to be of the worst; and fuch, as may alter all that you Now have done.

And if it be said, that this will hold against great politique bodyes as well, who may undoe the Common-wealth. The answer is, that the common and equall interest of all, and the common principles of preserving the rights and liberties of a State, and seeking the common good, is naturall unto the generality of men; But the truths of the Gospell and purity of Religion, and the power thereof, is contrary to the principles of all naturall men: and in all ages, the most of the Clergy have been aptest to corrupt the one, & oppose the other. And in those ages, when such Councells began to be Standing, and in most Credit, after the first 300. years, then was it, that the Mystery of Popery did worke most powerfully; and those superstitions, and corrupt opinions grew up, which made way for That man of sinne, and that body of Popish Dostrine, that

hath over-spread the world.

And, if there should be no danger of corrupting the Truth; yet the Churches, though reformed, comming all out of Popery, and not being fully enlightned in all things; and the first notion of any thing further in matters of Theology, usually falling into the hearts & spirits but of a few, we should have no further Truth taught, but oppressed, till an whole Nation is enlightned in it.

Sfz

Second-

Reasons of the diffenting Brethren against

132 II.

S condly, the efficacy of all remedies doth depend, First, upon Christs bleffing on them, which depends upon his institution of them; and Par ratio, or like reason will never set up an ordinance, unlesse Christ hath himself appointed it. And in the example, Acts 15. there is not this way of proceeding held forth. Secondly, it lies in suitablenesse to the condition of those that are to be dealt with. Now when many Churches deal with an erring Church, the Churches in a Province, with many erring Churches, or of a Nation with a Province, they must be in reason deals with, suitably to the condition of Churches, and of a multitude: And surely, a brotherly way of admonition, &c. withdrawing communion, is more fuittable unto fuch : As in the civil government, if a Province Rebels, or a great multitude of Subjects; should the State presently bang up all in that Province? Although unto particular persons, rebelling, this is efficacious to suppresse Rebellion. Thirdly, Christ hath suited his remedies. to all times, and unto all conditions; and how Nationall and Provinciall Assemblies could be, during the first 300. years, when yet Churches were well governed, is submitted.

And lastly, if the analogie of this 18. of Matthew be argued. Then

First, let the Analogie be kept. And then, when a Church hath offended other Churches, they are not to bring them, to a set Court of Judicature at first: for Christs rule is otherwise, in dealing with an offending brother: Electively to take two or three other Churches to admonish them, (which is more suited to that way fore-mentioned, Acts. 15.) As for the proceedings against a Brother in a Congregation, there is not a set appointed number of two or three standing persons to be the admonishers of all persons offending ere it comes to the Church; nor have they power to excommunicate. And thus by this proportion, instead of these set and standing Provinciall Assemblies, to whom causes are next brought; and these armed with power of Excommunication; there should onely be two or three, or more neighbour Churches to admonish the offending Church, and not a standing Court to bring it unto. And then

Secondly, let it be shewn where a standing Synod of Elders is called The Church; and how then can the Analogie hold, when it holds not in the Name, Tell the Church? The like reason holds not, unlesse these particular Congregations have the power of Excommunication; for otherwise, if these greater Assemblies power be argued from the Analogie of the lesser, and the same remedy Excommunication, and the particular Congregations have not, that allowed them; then by the principles of this Analogie, it is no where to be found: but as the Congregatio-

nall

nall Churches have power, onely to admonish and suspend from Sacraments, so the greater Assemblies should have no more also. And though the Church universall is called a Church and One Body to Christ; yet as materially considered, and not as a Politique body, in respect to government, which was never yet afferted by This Assembly.

Sie subscribitur:

Tho. Goodwin, William Bridge,
Philip Nye, William Greenhill,
Jer. Burroughes, William Carter.
Sidrach Sympson.

Concordat cum Originali.

Adoniram Byfield, Scriba.

SI3

A

Burk. 

THE

# ANSWER

OF THE

ASSEMBLY of DIVINES,

TO THE

# REASONS

OFTHE

## DISSENTING BRETHREN,

AGAINST THE

Proposition concerning the Subordination of Congregationall, Classicall, Provinciall, and Nationall Assemblies, for the Government of the Church.



LONDON,
Printed for Humphrey Harward. 1648.

ASSESSMENT OF THE PARTY OF THE

RIPSONS

. 11110

ATTENTO THE MAINTAIN AND A STATE

TELY WILLIAM

He all the substituted in the substitute of the





The Answer of the Assembly of Divines, unto the Reasons of the Dissenting Brethren against the Subordination of Ecclesiastical Assemblies of Government, viz.

It is lawfull and agreeable to the word of God, that there be a Subordination of Congregationall, Classicall, Provinciall and Nationall Assemblies, for the Government of the Church.



Efore wee make answer particularly to their Arguments, we desire these few things may be premised, to give light to the whole businesse.

1. That this Question is of the same nature with that against which our Brethren did give in their former Reasons, Whether many particular Congregations may be

under one Presbyteriall Government,] especially as themselves stated the question; For they there dispute onelyagainst joyning of such Congregations under one Presbytery, as have their Officers particularly fixed to them; (and such a Classicall Presbytery is a kind of Synod;) but they professedly decline the dispute, in case those Officers do all in common take care of those severall Congregations.

2. That the Pracognita before our Answer to those Reasons, have the

fame use here that they had there.

3. That most of these Arguments of our Brethren, are the same for substance, with some of their former Arguments, and only put now in-

to another dresse. As will appear further in scanning of them.

4. Our Brethren here deny not Synods (which they fay frequently are an holy ordinance of God) nor the severall sorts of Synods; but only the standing use of them, (as the Prelates did against the Non-conformists, See Parker de polit. Eccles. Lib. 3. c. 25.) and their Subordination one to another; not the Subordination of Congregations to them.

T t 5. Though

of their Arguments are framed against that their standing use, but only against the Subordination of them. Only they except sometimes against their standing use, because the causes to be judged there are Occasionall: which can be no just exception; For there may be standing Civill courts, yet such controversies are occasionall: And there may be not onely standing Physicians,, but Colledges of them, though diseases be occasionall; And there may be not only standing Presbyteries in Congregations, but also set times of their meeting, and yet their business be occasionall.

6. Our Brethren acknowledge (in their disputes and otherwise) so much concerning Synods and their usefulnesse, as is sufficient to warrant not onely the lawfulnesse of their use, but also the standing use of them. As for instance. 1. That they are an ordinance of God upon all occasions of difficulty. 2. That all the Churches of a Province being offended at a particular Congregation, may call that fingle Congregation to an account; yea all the Churches in a Nation, may call one or more Congregations to an account. 3. That they may examine and admonish, and, in case of obstinacy, declare them to be subverters of the Faith. 4. That Synods are of use to give advise to the Magistrate in matters of Religion. 5. That they have authority to determine concerning controversies of faith. 6. That their determinations are to be received with great honour and conscientious respect, and obligation as from Christ. 7. That if an offending Congregation refuse to submit to their determinations, they may withdraw from them and deny Church Communion and fellowship with them. 8. That this sentence of Non-communion may be ratified and backed with the authority of the Magistrate, to the end it may be the more effectuall. 9. That they may Convent and call before them any person within their bounds. whom the Ecclesiasticall businesse before them doth concerne; and may hear and determine such causes and differences as do orderly come before them. (Beside many other things which have in the Assembly been voted concerning Synods; to which they have entered no diffent.) And furely such things as these, wherein there will be occasion of the use of Synods by our Brethrens acknowledgement, are so ordinary, and likely to fall out so often, as will afford occasion enough for set, and frequent meeting of Synods.

7. That whereas our Proposition and proofes, concerning the severall forts of Synods and Church Assemblies, do only hold out an Agreeablenesse to the word, and a Warrantablenesse by the word, of these severall forts of Assemblies and their Subordination: Our Brethrens arguments do only indeavour to prove, that the Scripture doth not ex-

presse

presse or designe them; that is, that they have not an expresse institution: which is not our Assertion, and to which we spake sufficiently in our Answers to their former Reasons now before the Honourable Houses. For though we agree with our Brethren, that Synods are an ordinance of God; yet do not plead an expresse Institution, that each Synod must necessarily be thus and thus bounded, according to the division of Shires or Provinces, so that there may not be more or sewer then such a number, nor otherwise bounded or divided, (no more then either we, or our Brethren, can plead for the number and bounds of particular Congregations;) Though yet we do affirme that Synods thus bounded are agreeable to, and warranted by the word of God.

8. That the arguments of our Brethren against such Synods as we affert, do in many things militate as strongly against such Elective Synods which themselves allow, as against our Assertion. As will appear in the

particulars.

The Answer to their first Argument.

These things being premised, we come to their first Argument, which they forme thus; Those Courts which must have the most expresse warrant and designment for them in the Word, and have not; their power is to be suspected, and not creeted in the Church of God. But these ought to have

so, and have not. Therefore, &c.

Ans. 1. Our Brethren here lay out their strength in proving the Minor, and shew that these Assemblies are not Instituted; but wave that which is in question; whether they be agreeable to an Institution, or the word of God. For things which are not in every particular of them Instituted, may yet be agreeable to an Institution, and the Word of God. But if they would have concluded against the Proposition, they must have argued thus, Those Assemblies which (though for the generall they have an institution, and are an ordinance of God, yet in particular) have not the greatest and most expresse warrant and designement for them in the Word, and that both for their Subordination and Number, and also for their Bounds, and limits of Power, are not agreeable to, or warranted by the word of God. But if they contend onely, that what hath not such express designment hath not in those particulars an expresse Institution, and may not therefore be erected as So instituted, they contend about that which is not now in question.

2. Their Argument if it have any strength at all against our proposition, proves more then our Brethren pretend to strive for; For they professe here to dispute against the Subordination of them, and not against the being and existence of them; which they grant to be lawfull and usefull. If our Brethren can show such a particular expresse designement

Tt2 for

The Answer of the Assembly of Divines, unto the Reasons of

for the being of them, we shall be glad to hear it: If they cannot, but say onely (as we doe) that they are agreable to, & warranted by the word; then either their argument hurts not not us, or else it overthrow

what themselves grant.

But we will examine the Reasons our Brethren bring to prove their Minor. Yet must tell them withall, that their Major (of which they offer no proof at all) may admit of an exception. For though it were granted, That fuch things as have expresse designment in the word, ought in the practice of them to be conformed to that designement (in their bounds, limits, number, &c. if any fuch designement be) yet we must not therefore infer, That, if there be any failure in any of these, the thing were better not be at all, yea ought not at all to be; which is the sense of their Major Proposition. The Passover had particular designement for the time, place, persons, &c. Yet Hezekiah thought fit to keep a Passover, though varying in some particulars, from that designement, rather then not to keep a Passover at all. Yet say our Brethren in this Argument, That SY NOD's which themselves call an holy ordinance of God, and grant that they have an expresse Warrant and designement for them in the word, (or elfe, by this argument, they must not, as here they do, grant them lawfull, and of great use) may not yet be at all crested, unlesse we can find out the Greatest and most Expresse warrant and designement for their Subordination, and Number, And for their Bounds, and limits of power. In Civill Courts, we are sure they may be agreeable to, and warrantable by the Word of God, though they have no such expresse particular designement in all those circumstances; But, say our Brethren, in the Church of God, Courts may not be erected unlesse there be such defignements of these particulars, though the Courts themselves be de-To the first part of the Minor. signed.

To prove the first part of their Minor (that Synods ought to have such expresse warrant and designement in these particulars) they bring

five reasons, and in all of them professe to argue a pari ratione.

But we aske th m, whether argumentum a pari ratione, be a sufficient argument in the point in band, and others of like nature: If it be, then they must not blame us for using such arguments, but grant our arguing (à pari natione) from analogie, though in matters of institution, to be a good way of arguing If it be not; then they ought to have brought other arguments themselves: For it is not enough to plead, that We use such arguments, unless they say too, that me do wel in using them. For if argumentum ad homine only, be a sufficient argument against our proposition; then is Responsion ad hominem a sufficient Answer to their Argument, and we need say no more to these sive arguments, then That it is a may of arguing which

theny

I.

Their first reason a pari ratione is this; That in the Government of the Church, For the Subordination of OFFICER'S there was an express institution, I Cor. 12.28. God hath fet in his Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, (and Evangelists, Who were of a parallel order) thirdly Teachers: (they should have added, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, Governments, diversities of tongues) But say they, Christ hath not set the like Subordination of Courts. (They should have said, Therefore there Ought To Be the like for the Subordination of Courts; for they are now proving the first part of their Minor, That such ought to be, not the second part that such is not.)

In answer to this we say. 1. That they do not in this Argument undertake to prove that Synods are not of flanding use, much lesse, that

they may not be erected, but that they may not be Subordinate.

2. That, whatever Subordination there was, of an Officer of one kind to an Officer of another kind, and whatever power and authority Apofles had over others, yet no such Subordination of Officers can be proved out of This place. A Diversity of Officers may be proved from hence, and perhaps a difference in Dignity, (that greater is he that Prophesie's hen he that speaketh with Tongues) but not a Subordination of officers for Government. And we do not believe that our Brethren will say, that Kuling Elders (whom they grant to be included in Governments) are subordinate to those that work Miracles, and Those to Teachers: Those to Prophets, and Those againe to Apostles; and that Appeales might be made from the Ruling Elder to him that workes Miracles,

from him to the Teacher, &c.

3. How doth his Text prove a Subordination of Evangelists to Apofiles, and of Teachers to them? For the Evangelist is not mentioned in the Text: As for what they adde, (who were of a parallel order) 1. This is but Gratis dictum, they doe not prove it; if they alledge that in Eph.4.11. Evangelists are reckoned Apostles, after and before Pastors and Teachers, and therefore must be of the same order with Prophets; we answer; 2. That the Method there wied doth not prove a Subordination, which is the point in question; for if so, then must Evangelists be subordinate to Prophets, not coordinate and of a parallel order: And they might as well, for ought there appears, be of a parallel order with Pafor and Teachers, as of a parallel order with Prophets. And 3. If it be granted that they are of a parallel order with Prophets, yet that there must be therefore the same Subordination of them to Apoliles, and of Teachers to them, is not an expresse Institution, but onely an Argument,

Tt 3

à pari natione, Because there is the same reason for the Subordination of Evangelists, that there is of Prophets. 4. We hence observe that our Brethren make use of an Argument onely, à pari ratione, to prove a positive Institution. For their Argument is to this purpose; For the Subordination of Prophets there is an expresse Institution, & there is the like reason for the Subordination of Evangelists, Ergo, Evangelists are also subordinate. We might as wel argue, that for the Subordination of Officers there is an expresse Institution, and there is the like reason for Subordination of Courts; Therefore Courts also are to be subordinate. And if they will not allow this to be a just exception, [That for the Subordination of Prophets there was a special Institution, or essentiation of Evangelists, Therefore there must be also an expresse Institution for that too (and not onely an argument à pari ratione) or essent must not be owned, They must not then make use of this argument against us, but do themselves deny the strength of it.

4. They might as wel argue, There was an expresse Institution for Subordination in the Church, or else it might not be owned; and therefore (& pari ratione) there must be as expresse an Institution for taking it away, or else it must be owned stil. Yea that, There was an express Institution for setting Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets, Miracles, Tongues, &c. in the Church: and therefore (à pari ratione) there must be as expresse an institution for removing them, or else they continue still. For there is the same Authority requilite to remove an institution, that there is to establish it. And when our Brethren have well considered these things, together with the practifes of their owne wayes, and so stated, interpreted, and limited what they say here, as that themselves will be willing to stand to it, and their own principles and practifes not vanish before it; we doubt not but to shew better and clearer warrant for Synods, for their Subordination, and for their standing use, (though yet our Proposition speakes nothing of the standing use of Synods) then they can do for many practifes of their owne, which yet they beleeve, not only to be Agreeable to, and Warranted by the Word, but to have the nature of Institutions.

II. Their second reason is this; That Presbyterian's require an Institution in the case of the subordination of Bishops, Arch-Bishops, Patriarchs, and Popes; But as we read not in the Scripture of the name of an Arch-Bishop, nor of the thing; so we read not in Scripture of Councells, Provinciall and Nationall, names or things. Yea, and the disadvantage is rather on this side; for we are sure; that once there was in the Church, such a subordination of Officers, Evangelists over Pastors, and Apostles over Evangelists, but of

Such

fuch a subordination of Councells in an Aristocraticall way there is nothing to

be found.

Ans. 1. Still we note our Brethrens pleading for Episcopacy; yea, for Papacy, (which both they and we have covenanted to extirpate) rather then the Government of the Reformed Churches, which both they and we have covenanted to maintaine, at least against the common E-

nemy.

2. Of Prelacy amongst Ministers, we finde nothing in Scripture, but much against it; and therefore Presbyterians do not onely call for a warrant or institution for the Subordination of Bishops, Arch-Bishops, but for the being of them as our Brethren themselves observe: The usuall exception against this subordination of such Church-Officers is, that in Scripture, we read neither of the name of an Arch-Bishop, nor the thing; and therefore not of a Subordination to them. But of Synods, our Brethren will not fay that we finde nothing in Scripture, either name or thing: For themselves acknowledge them an holy Ordinance of God. And for the Bounds of them, whether they may confift of the Ministers of one Province, or more Provinces, or lesse then a Province; is no more a matter of Institution, then whether a particular Congregation may confift of 40,50, or 100 Members; and those inhabiting within one mile, two miles, or three miles distance; but is to be regulated by generall rules of the Word, and particular circumstances of times, places, and persons. And for their Subordination, we have already shewed (in our former Answer, and the proofes of our Propositions) sufficient warrant from the generall rules of the Word, the light of nature, and parity of reason; beside, what is strongly argued from the Precedent of the Jewish Church, in matters of Ecclesiastical concernment. But our Brethren should have remembred, that they are but proving the first part of their Minor, (that Synods must have such Institution;) & therefore most of this discourse is not to the purpose in this place.

Their third instance, a pari ratione, is this; As in other Societies and Bodies politick, in the rearing of a contignation of power, there must be an Ordinance or Creation from man; not onely of the severall kindes of Officers, but of severall Courts; and a set and expresse Order, both of the number and bounds of Courts of sudicatory, from whom, and to whom Appeals are to be made, and in what cases, &c. Which Courts the greater and higher they be, the more expresse evidence and warrant for their power there is and ought to be, as for Parliamentary power & the priviledges thereof: So must there be proportionably a Divine Institution for the Contignation & Subordination of Spirituall power, beside that of the Distinction of Officers themselves.

III.

Ans. Not to Dispute the Principles of Policy here laid down; Whether a State may not give power to the Justices of Peace in such or such a County, to preserve the Peace there; and see that the known Lawes of the Kingdome be observed, without setting down expressly, how often, at what places, and in how many divisions they shall meet for that purpose; and how many forts of Committees or Sub-committees they shall make of themselves for the better effecting of it? Or, whether they may not give Commission to a Generall to Command an Army, for such and such purposes; without prescribing expressly, into how many Companies, Regiments, Brigades,&c. they shall be divided; and in what Proportions and Subordinations? Or, whether a Parliament must have more expresse evidence and warrant for all particulars of Power or Authority that they exercise, or Priviledge that they challenge, then inferiour Judicatories need to have? We Answer (to their Argument, à pari ratione, upon this supposition.)

1. That our Brethren oft except against such arguing as this; Thus it is in Civill States, therefore thus it ought to be in Church Go-

vernment.

2. That this Argument for substance, is the same with that in their former Discourse, of Power over Power; which we then Ans-

wered at large.

3. We here adde, That there ought not to be here required such an expresse and plaine Designment out of the Word, as in Givill and Humane institutions for Civill Courts and their Subordination: the Scripture not being written Systematically, nor delivered in the manner as Humane Lawes are, but as a golden Mine to be diligently searched in all the veines: and therein we may finde sufficient for our warrant and direction, together with the light of Nature and Reason, to apply these Rules to particular Cases. And by such Rules our Brethren themselves will not refuse to goe in many particulars in the Government of their Churches.

IIII.

Their fourth instance is, If in a particular Church Christ hath prescribed the severall Subordinations of proceedings, with the Degrees, Bounds, and Order of them, Mat. 18. So that it were not orderly in a Set Way to make any more steps or degrees of Admonition, beside those which Christ hath designed: it had been much more necessary to have appointed the like about shese greater Assemblies, which have the power of a Sentence or Judgement; and of which, if Christ hath not set them forth their bounds and order, None can tell what belongs to them, or which of them first to appeal unto.

Ans. 1.

Ans. 1. Our Brethren here say not, That Christ hath set a standing fixt Order and Subordination of proceedings in a particular Church, which is alwayes to be held unto; but onely, That in a set ordinary way we are to make no more; tacitely yeilding (as some of them did in the Assembly expressy) that after one or more Admonitions by one, then by two or three, there may sometimes (if there be hope of gaining him thereby) be an Admonition by eight or tenne, before they tell it the

Church.

2. Our Brethren should have shewed what Method, Terms, Bounds, or Subordinations of proceedings, Christ had prescribed to the Church When offences are PUBLICK and openly Scandalous, as well as When PRIVATE and known but to a single Brother: Unlesse they would give leave to argue, as here themselves doe: [That if Christ have prescribed the severall Subordinations of proceedings, and set forth the Degrees, Bounds, and Order of them, in case of a PRIVATE offence, and how the Church may come to take cognizance of it: then much more should this have been done in case of a Public K offence and scandall, if he had intended the Church should at all proceed upon it; which if he have not done, the Church (it seemes by this argument) may not take notice of That at all: ] For if they say, That the Directions here given, concerning a private offence, will pari ratione serve for direction and warrant to proceed in a just proportion (mutatis mutandis) in case of a publick scandall; We may say the like concerning Synods, That the Directions here given concerning the manner of proceeding in a particular Church, will afford a sufficient direction and warrant to proceed in a like proportion, in a Synod, or Combination of Churches.

3. Our Brethren should have shewed, That by Church, is there meant a particular Congregation, and That onely: For if Telling a Sy-NOD, or a Church of Churches (as Mr. Cotton calls it) may be said to be a Telling the Church; and if those that refuse to hear a Synod, may be saidto refuse to hear the Church; and if the Presence of Christ promised to two or three gathered together in his name, may be applyed to a Synodicall meeting, as well as to a meeting in a perticular Church; and if that Ratification in heaven, of what the Apostles (and those who succeed them in that power) doe bind or loofe on Earth, may as well be meant of their power in Synods, as of their power in a particular Congregation; (and that it may not be so, our Brethren have not yet shewed:) Why may we not then beleeve, That the Bounds and Limits, and Order of proceedings in a Synod (which themselves grant to be Lawfull, and an Ordinance of God) have as sufficient direction and warrant from this place, as the proceedings in a particular Congregation? Nor have our Brethren

Brethren yet shewed that the Synodicall proceedings, Asts, 15. were not in pursuance of, and obedience to this Order of Christ, in Mat. 18.

4. If our Brethren had shewed, That it is meant (properly and immeelately) onely of a fingle Congregation; and that the manner and degrees, and Subordinations of proceeding, both in cases of private and publick scandalls, had been so distintly set downe, as not to admit of any variation, either in the number of Admonitions, or steps of proceeding by way of gradation, before they come to the highest degree in that particular Church; or in the manner of proceeding there, to be more or leffe flow or expeditious in proceeding, before they come to the last sentence, according as the nature of the Crime, or quality and disposition of the person might require: Yet there might be reason why the same particolors should not be so precisely determined for Associations or Combinations of Churches in their Bounds and Limits; because, though where they can be had, they much conduce to the well-being of particular Churthes; yet our Lord knew that it would not be alike easie at all times. and in all places to obtaine them, in the like extent or proportion; in regard sometimes of persecution, or at least for want of countenance from the Magistrate, sometimes by reason of the paucity and distance of Churches; and sometimes for other difficulties and obstructions that may hinder: fo that where they can be had, they have the Authority and Bleffing of a Divine Institution, being an Ordinance of God; yet are not To precifely determined, as that they must be so many, so often, and so many Subordinations or gradations in them. Sometimes no more Churches perhaps may have that opportunity to Associate, then may all joyne in one CLASSIS; sometimes no more Classes then to make one Sy-NOD: and yet elsewhere, or at other times, there may be opportunity, not onely of particular Churches combining in Classes, but of Classes in Synods, and many Synods in one, or more larger Affociations.

5. The Order and Degrees of ELECTIVE SYNODS, (which yet our Brethren allow as an Ordinance of God) are no more set downe, or limited in Scripture, then the order or degrees of STANDING Synods: And the same inconveniences which our Brethren here object, (and many more) will fall as heavy upon such Elective Synods. For, if when a difficulty salls out in a particular Congregation in our Brethrens way; some should plead to have the aide of one fifter Church, some of another; some of two or three, some of all in the Province or Nation; because in the multitude of Counfellors there is safety: Or, if they would goe first to one, then joyne two or three others, then call in the rest if need be; or sirting per salum to them all; what have our Brethren here to plead but Generall Rules, Christian prudence, Light of Nature? Even the same with Us.

TEST

Their last instance a pari ratione, is from the Jewish Church; In the Church of the Jewes, lay they, the Subordinations that were, were fet forth and determined by Institution or Example, how many Courts there Could be, and where to reft.

And I. We shall not need here to dispute, whether all the Courts in Israel are set forth and determined in Scripture; or whether no Court there, either was or might be set up before they had either Institution, or Precedent example for it: But we suppose it will be hard for our Bre-

thren to prove it.

2. Suppose them so to be; yet there is not a like reason, that there must be now a like particular determination; because all Churches under the New Testament are not of alike extent, and alike capable of Associations.

2. The JEWISH Subordinations, being no Temple Ordinances, nor Typicall or Ceremoniall, doe in the morall equity of them concern Us, as well as Them; at least we may, with much more reason urge an Argument, a pari ratione, from Subordinations in the Jewish Church to prove a Subordination still; then our Brethren can argue from thence against it: For the Grounds of that Subordination being from morall equity; and the Ends & Necessity of it being the same, Now as Then, viz. Refolving difficult cuses, ordering matters of Common concernment, Reforming Offences in Inferiour Societies, Receiving Appeals, Redressing of Injuries and Neglects in male administration, &c. ) the same reason still remaines, that for the fame Ends and Purpoles, there should be Subordinations now in the Christian Church, that was then in the fewish.

And thus we have answered their Reasons, (a pari ratione) for the proof of the first part of their Minor, That Synods must have the GREA-TEST and most EXPRESSE Warrant and Designment in the Word, &c. Its enough for us, if there be but a SUFFICIENT Warrant, we must not prescribe the Holy Ghost, How Great, and how Expresse that Warrant must be. And when our Brethren shall undertake to prove the practices of their owne way; (Gathering Churches out of Churches; Ordination and Deposition of Ministers, by the people Alone: Their elective Synods; Their Non-communicating of Churches in their way; that one single Church may denounce the sentence of Non-communion against other Churches, whether one or more; yea, against All the Churches in a Province or Kingdome, whom That particular Church supposeth to miscarry; with many other practices, which if need were, we might instance in; ) we doubt not but they will abate some of these expressions; and will defire us to except of somewhat leffe then the GREA-Vu 2

TEST and most EXPRESSE Warrant and Designment in the Word, both for their SUBORDINATION and NUMBER, and for their BOUNDS and Limits of POWER: And some of them have told us, That the Rule they goe by, in searching after Institutions; is not to rest satisfied with such Texts onely, as doe clearly set them downe, or must necessarily be so interpreted: But if to their Consciences, they seeme by any circumstance, to incline or lean this way, rather then the other; and that this seemes to be the meaning of the holy Ghost, rather then the other, (though the Text might possibly admit of another interpretation, yet) it is enough to their Consciences to prove an Institution.

To the Second part of their Minor.

The Second part of their Minor they come next to prove, That these Synods have not Such Expresse Warrant and Designment; (They should have proved, That they have No Designment or Warrant At All; or else they hurt not our Proposition, which saith onely, They are

Agreeable to, and Warranted by the Word of God.)

For proof of it they say, 1. The New Testament is silent in it. And if it be said that all Nations (we suppose they would have said, Whole Nations) were not then converted: they Answer, The Apostles, though they had not lived to see that which might occasion such an Institution; yet would have left order for the time to come.

Ans. 1. The Scripture is no more Silent of these, then of Elective

Synods.

2. The Subordination of particular Churches to greater Assemblies, is held out, AEt. 15. And in Mat. 18. (as we have shewed in our proofs of this Proposition;) such particulars only excepted, which are common with the Church to other Bodyes politick, and are determinable by Natures Light: So that, herein there was sufficient order taken, not only

for the present, but for the time to come.

3. Our Brethren themselves acknowledge, that there is, Att. 15. a going out from a particular Church, Electively to another Church, or Churches, (so that there is not a Totall Silence in this point) but they do not tell us, To how many Churches they may goe out, nor, To which sirft, nor, How often they may goe out successively, in case their Divisions or Difficulties be not removed upon their sirst going out. And our Brethren tell us at other times, that a Church may not only goe out, but may be called out, to give an account to a Church or Churches offended; yea, to All the Churches of a Province or Nation (which how it can be done without a Provinciall or Nationall Synod, we cannot tell;) and this is no going out Electively, for it is not at their choice, what Churches they shall give account to: But when our Brethren undertake to

the Differting Br. against the Subordination of Synods.

prove this, we believe they will content themselves with some such proofs as we have produced for our Proposition.

But 2. Say our Brethren, The Apostles lived to see many particular Churches, in Provinces and Nations; and though all the Inhabitants were not Members of Churches, yet there was Matter for moulding them into these Subordinations, as now in France, where not a third part are Protestants, and in the Low-Countries, where not a tenth part are Church-Members; so that, if these superstructions had been so absolutely necessary, it had

been as necessary that the Apostles should have appointed them.

Ans. Whether in France, not a third part be Protestants, or in the Low-Countries not a tenth part Members of Churches, we stand not now to dispute. And whether it were Necessary for the Apostles to have Appointed such Subordinations, if they be at all Warrantable; doth not belong to this place, but to the first part of the Minor, where we have spoken to it: Onely this we adde here, That they should have shewed that they had a Possibility, Liberty, and Opportunity of erecting such Subordinations, as well MATTER for the moulding of them. We have not Classicall, Provinciall, Nationall Assemblies at present in England; not because we think we ought not to have them, or that we may not have them, but because we have not had Opportunity to erect them.

But that which our Brethren are now to prove, is, that the Apostles DID Nor appoint them: And how should that be proved, but by this Reason? We read not of these Subordinations in the Nations of Judea, Asia, Crete, in which were famous particular Churches; therefore there were no such Subordinations: And that Christ writing to the seven Churches of Asia, writes to each Church apart, and not to a Provinciall, or Na-

tionall Synod of them.

Ans. 1. They might as well argue, Because we read not that the Apostles did Appoint in the Churches of Judea, Asia, and Crete, (or, that those Churches did practice) the ordinances of publicke Singing of Psalmes; Reading of the Word; and Baptizing of Children; the Examination and Tryall of those that were to be admitted Members of Churches, before their Admission; Catechizing; Visitation of the sicke; that the Women did eate and drink at the Lords Table as well as the men, or the like; Therefore there were no such things in those Churches. If it be said, There was Warrant and Appointment for those things, in other tlaces of Scripture: So say we of Synods and their Subordination. The Scripture giveth not many Instances of one particular of Church Government; we have one Instances of Excommunication in the Church

of

of Corinth, and but that one of a Churches Excommunicating in the New Testament; And we have one Instance of a Synod; and why should not That be as sufficient as the Other?

-2. Neither do we read of any Elective Synod for Arbitration in these Churches, such as our Brethren yet hold for an Ordinance of God; and we are sure their Errours, Divisions, &cc. needed the help of every Ordinance, as our Brethren confesse. And Christ writes no more to the seven Churches of Asia, concerning such Elective Synods, then of these Subordinations: and the Objection lies as strongly against their way, as ours.

3. But this we read sufficiently, That the Church of Christis, One Body, and the Officers given to it, for the good of all the Body: and we read of All the Churches of Galatia written to, as one Body, as one Lump, and we read of the Communion of the Churches one with another in many particulars, as we showed at large in our former Answer; which is suf-

ficient for our Affertion.

And as to what they alledge of Christ writing to the seven Churches apart, and reproving Each of them for their own disorders, which our Brethren suppose he would not have done, if they had been in a standing

Association for Government. We Answer,

T. If so; yet we need not inquire far for a Reason: They were severall Churches, and had their severall Faults, and needed severall Counsells, and consequently severall Letters: as in a Kingdome, where all are associated; yet the severall Provinces or Congregations, may need severall Reproofs or Advises; some being Cold, Luke-warme, Declining, others

Pure, Zealous, Growing, &c.

2. But if our Brethren consider better of it, they shall finde that all these seven; Letters (yea, the whole Revelation) were written to All the seven Churches in common, as appeares, Revel. 1.4. yet so that each might take special notice of that which did most peculiarly concerne them: As when a Minister, in a Sermon to a mixed Congregation, tels some of one fault, some of another; reproves the Rich perhaps for Pride; the Poor, for Envy; the Magistrate for negligence in his place; the Masters, Servants, Parents, Children, each for their several faults; or perhaps Reproves some, Commends others, &c. which doth not yet hinder, but that all these make one Congregation. Or, to use their owne Instance, if a letter be directed to a National or Provincial Synod, it is very proper to shew therein, what in one Congregation or Classis, is to be commended; what in another is to be Reproved; and not promisently to reprove or commend all alike: And our Brethren may remember, that in some Letters directed to this Assembly, there have been some

time large Apostrophe's directed particularly to themselves, and not spoken to the whole Assembly, notwithstanding they are a part of it, and in a standing association therein with the rest: And so it is evident that the whole Epistle or Book of the Revelation is directed in common, to ALL these seven Churches joynely, though yet there be something spoken par-

ticularly to each, beside that which is spoken in common to All.

for we have no more mention of Elective Synods, then of Subordinate; Pergamus, and Thyatira, though troubled with Errours in Doctrine, &c. yet are not directed to feek out to an Elective Synod to redresse them; nor are the other Churches directed to call them to give an account; nor is any of the Churches either commended for so doing, or blamed for not doing it. Yet both of these, according to our Brethrens principles, ought to have been done; and this silence about it, will not (we believe) be admitted by our Brethren as a sufficient argument to overthrow either the Lawfulnesse, or the Institution, of Elective Synods.

To what in the last place, our Brethren adde, That they are never called by the name CH uRCH, but CHURCHES. We Answer, as before, whether they be or no, it matters not; we inquire for Things, not for Names. Nor 2. Doth the name Chur CHE's prove that they were not one Church by Association; no more then that the Flocks, Gen. 30. 36. 38. were not one Flock, as they are called Verse 31, 32. And Peter speaking of many Churches, yet calls them The FLOCK, I Tet. 5. 2. And 3. The many Churches or Congregations in ferusalem, are yet called one Church; and so at Ephesiu; as we have shewed already at large; (to fay nothing of the Church of Antioch, and the Church of Corinth, which is likewise called Churches, 1 Cor. 14. 34. And the often mention of The Church in such an ones house; which, whether it be meant of a Christian Family, or of a Congregation ordinarily meeting there; yet were they part of a greater society consisting of many of these, which is also called a Church:) And when Paul is said to persecute the Church of God, 1 Cor. 15.9. Phil. 3.6. and Gal. 1.13. yet were the Churches of Judea either this Church, or part of this Church which Paul persecuted, Verse 21, 22. And indeed, whether a Family or Congregation, or a Combination of them are called a Church, they are but Synecdochically so called, as being all parts of that one Church, which is the Body of Christ. And Stephanus observes as much in his Thesaurus, Tom. 2. p. 23. Hinc sit, ut 'Exxxnoiae in numero multitudinis sape occurrat, quum alioqui unam eandemque omnes efficiant Ecclesiam. And as Christ the Husband hath but one Spouse, (though yet Synecdochically,

152 The Answer of the Assembly of Divines, unto the Reasons of

chically, every Beleever may be called the fouse of Christ) and Christ the Head, hath but one Body; so but one Church, which is the Body of Christ, Ephes. 1. 22, 23. And our Brethren themselves in their Apologeticall Narration, page 6. speaking of Parochiall Congregations in England, call them the true Churches and Body of Christ, not Bodies of Christ, though yet each of them, by the same reason that they are called a Church, might have been called The Body of Christ; yet all of them together, are indeed but a part of that Body.

#### The Answer to their Second Argument.

Their second Argument is formed thus; If there be such a Subordination of Synods, then there is no Independency; but in an Oecumenicall Councell. Which we suppose they have therefore set downe briefly; because if fully set downe, it would not sound so well: For thus it should be; If there may be a Subordination of Congregationall, Classicall, Provinciall and Nationall Assemblies; then there is no Independency but in an

Oecumenicall Councell.

Ans. Our Brethren know there is nothing of Oecumenicall Councells in our Proposition, or of Subordination to them, or Dependence on them. For though the Assembly had afferted in another Proposition, (to which our Brethren entred no Diffent) that there may be an Oecumenicall Synod when it can be had; yet, what the Power thereof is, and, How far other Assemblies, Depend on it; they have not afferted, but thought fit rather to consider of (uch Assemblies, as through the blessing of God. we may possibly enjoy, and what power they have. But if our Brethren will from our Proposition inferre that, by a Consequence of their owne, they should have added some Proof of that Consequence; or at least an Explication, that we might see wherein the strength of their Consequence lyes: For such a Consequence as this, If there May be a Nationall, there Mus T be an Oecumenicall Synod; and if there may be a Subordination to That, there must be a Subordination to This, (which seemes to be the strength of their Argument) had need have some proof. Our Brethren grant that there MAY BE a going out for advise to other Churches; to the Churches of a Province, to the Churches of a Nation, if occasion and opportunity serve; yet doe not say, that there Mus T BE a going out to all the Churches in the world, whether there can be fuch a meeting or no; or that Gods Providence is not sutable to his Institutions, if such a meeting cannot be had; or that there must be an injurious confining to the Advice of the Churches in one Nation, if they cannot have the Advice of such an Oecumenick meeting; which yet, if it

conld

could be had, were like to be remedium efficacissimum, and a holy Ordi-

nance of God, as well as any of the rest.

But since our Brethren have chosen this discourse about Occumenick Synods, and therein let passe the proof of the Consequence; and onely give some Reasons to make the Consequent seeme improbable, we shall briefly follow them therein: And doe first observe how ill their three Confirmations of it hang together; in the first they reason against us, as holding a Nationall Church not to be Independent; in the third, as if we held a Nationall Church to be Independent; in the second they argue against the very being and existence of Oecumenick Sy. ods.

First, say our Brethren, this would bring in a forraign Ecclesiasticall Power over each State and Kingdome; to wit, if their Consequence be good, and that there be no Independency but in an Occumenick Councell.

Ans. We suppose they would say, over each NATIONALL CHURCH or Nationall Assembly, not over each State and Kingdome: The Church and Civil state are differing things; as the Kingdom of Christ, and the Kingdom of the world: To bring in fuch a Forraign Ecclefiasticall Power as should be over Civil States, is Popish; But the help of an Occumenick Synod, when it may be had, is no Forraign Power to the Church, nor any Hurt to the Civil State. The Ordinances of Christ are none of them Forraigne to the Church, nor any of them Hurtful to the State.

Secondly, say our Brethren, Such a Councell being the most Efficacious and Ultimate Remedy, must be supposed to have some speciall Indigitation in the Word, and speciall Promise made to it; and that God, who suites his Providences to his Institutions, would have taken order that it should be existent in all ages; whereas the Church manted Occumenick Councells for

300 years.

Anf. 1. If we should grant our Brethren, not onely what they say, That the Church wanted them for three hundred yeares; but, That perhaps, there never yet was an intire compleat Generall Councel rightly constituted, and God onely knowes whether ever there shall be one or no: Yet this proves not, but that, if it can be had, it may lawfully be made use of, and looked on as an Ordinance of God, with expectation of Gods special Presence, Assistance, and Blessing, as in other Ordinances; and that a Synod of severall Nations may be made use of, in such a measure as may be obtained. For God, having given sufficient warrant for combinations and communion of Churches, for their mutuall good, and not having limited it to such or such Bounds, beyond which they

Xx

Keyes.

tions that may be obtained, even of the whole Oecumenick Church. And our Brethren must admit this in their way; for they having, as they conceive, a warrant for going out to advise with other Churches, and not being bounded, either how often they may so goe forth, nor to how many Churches; they conceive it lawfull upon this warrant electively to advise with all the Churches in a Province, a Nation; yea, the Christian Preface to world: And they doe not thinke, that the defect of Opportunity thus to M. Cottons advise, perhaps for some hundreds of years, doth make such advising to be unlawfull, or not agreeable to Gods institution, if it could be had: though it may perhaps render it difficult, if not impossible. For we may not presse that Principle (of Gods Suiting his Providences to his Institutions) fo far, as if God were bound in his Providence to afford at all times an opportunity, for doing of what soever by his Institution might lawfully be done. We know the Arminians have made an ill use of such a Principle in the point of Universall Grace, quia Deus non deficit in necessaris ad salutem: And it were hard either for us, or for our Brethren to admit fuch a Principle in the matter in hand; That nothing is egreeable to. and warranted by the Word of God, but what hath had, and shall have an existence in all Ages. Our Brethren hold Ruling Elders to be not only Agreeable to, and Warranted by the Word of God, but of Divine Institution; and yet we think they will not say, They have an existence at all times in all their Churches. And we suppose also, they will hardly prove that in all the reign of Antichrist; every Ordinance of Christ had such existence as they require here to be shewed of Occumenicall Synods.

2. But if this Principle were good; then doe our Brethren apparently overthrow the Consequence of their owne Argument: For how easie is it to reply to that Argument, That though there be, and ought to be a subordination, of Congregationall, Classicall, Provinciall, and Watianall Assemblies in this Kingdome, where the Providence of God, which is futable to his Institutions, hath afforded a Possibility and Opportunity of them; yet no necessity of their dependence on, or subordination to an Oecumenick Councel, which (by our Brethrens Argument) must not be accounted an Institution, because, if so, the providence of God would so have

provided that it might be alwayes existent.

3. Yet withall, we must remember, that our Brethren (what ever they here argue) doe not deny either the lawfulnesse of them, or the usefulnesse of them, but onely their standing use, and the subordination to them. Yet this Argument, if it prove any thing, proves that they may not be at all.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, say our Brethren, There must be an injurious independency set up in a Nativiall Synod, because when a man hath appealed from other Courts to it, and upon the sentence thereof, comes to be Banished, and have his Estate forfeited to the ruine of himself and his family; then most of all, he needs such an effectuall remedy as a generall Councell, and loe it is not: And if the Nationall Assembly be Independent, and upon the sentence thereof, the extremest punishment, but that of Death, be to be inslicted, it had need shew a Designment and Warrant from God, to be the Supream and Ultimate Court.

Ans. 1. Why did our Brethren except that of Death? When as Nationall Synods have as much power to inflict Death, as they have to inflict these punishments which they reckon up; Banishment, Forfeiture of goods, The extremest Punishment but that of Death. For they know that we doe not affert a power of inflicting either one or other of these, to be in Ecclesiasticall Judicatory at all; nor is it practiced in the Reformed Churches: And why our Brethren should goe about to cast such odious infinuations, without a cause, both on us and them, we cannot tell. If it be, Because that, after the Church hath passed their censure, the Magistrate doth sometimes, when he seeth cause, and according as the offence deserveth, adde his sentence too, (yea, Death it self, if he see cause, and the crime deserve it:) This doth no way concerne the Nationall Assembly (or inferiour Assemblies) at all; to which no more belongeth under a Christian, then under an Heathen Magistrate. Nor doth it more concerne w, then it doth concerne their way: For their Apologeticall Narration, pag. 19. informes us, that their Sentence of Noncommunion may be affifted and backed with the sentence of the Magistrate, as well as Excommunication; and may in that respect, be made as efficacions: And we know that the practice in the Churches of New-England, is consonant to it, where the Civill Magistrate doth with as much, if not more rigour and severity, back their Churchcensures, as in the Reformed Churches Governed by Presbyteries and Synods.

2. The Sentence of the Nationall Assembly, how dreadfull and terrible foever our Brethren please here to represent it, is no other then what They say belongs every particular Congregation: For Excommunication is their highest Censure, and this, say our Brethren, every particular Cengregation may inslict. And if this be Independency, yea, an injurious Independency, that when this is inslicted by a National Assembly, there may be no Appeal from it; Why doe our Brethren complaine, that that proud and insolent title of INDEPENDENCY is affixed to them, as their claime, Apologeticall Narration. pag. 23. when as they claim that, which them-

X x 2 felves

### The Answer of the Assembly of Divines, unto the Reasons of

felves here call an Injurious INDEPENDENCY? For it is a principle of their way, That from the sentence of Excommunication in a particular congregation, there is no Appeale, nor is it reversible by any power on earth, but themselves alone. And for the injurious nesse of such independency, we desire it may be considered, whether most injury is likely to be done, and remaine unredressed, where in a Nation many thousand Congregations, shall each of them have an Independent power of censuring without Appeal; or where the party aggrieved may Appeal from them to a Classis, from thence to a Provinciall, and from thence to a Nationall Assembly, though when he comes there, he can appeale no further? Especially, when as men are oft imboldned to sin, when they know that none can judicially call them to account: And, on the other side, the very remembrance or feare of an Appeale, whereby their actions may come to be scanned, is a great motive to make Judges proceed more righte-

oully.

156

3. But we doe not affert, That a Nationall Affembly is Independent: but though we doe not think it fit to trouble an Oecumenicall Councel with every particular difference or controversie that may arise in a Church, (as neither to trouble a Parliament with every particularity of civill difference, which may be as well determined in inferiour Courts) yet in grave and weighty matters, we doubt not but there may be great use of a well constituted Occumenicall Assembly, (if it may be had) and great help by it: and that a Nationall Affembly may be accountable to it, (at least as much as our Brethren hold a particular congregation to be accountable.) But if a person conceiving himselfe to be injured in a Nationall Assembly cannot obtaine redresse, either from another succeeding Nationall Assembly, or from a superiour Assembly, he must commit his cause to God; and so must be that may conceive himselfe wronged by a Clafficall or Provinciall Assembly, if he cannot have the opportunity of appealing farther: In like manner, as he that thinks himselfe civilly injured by the Parliament, or Supreame power in a State, and hath no other way to obtaine redresse. Yet is not this a reason why we may not have recourse to such mayes of remedy as God affords, because there may be a further remedy, which God at present affords not? or because we are deprived of an appeale to an Oecumenicall Synod, which seldome, or never, or not without great difficulty can be had; therefore not to make use of Provinciall or Nationall Assemblies, and Appeales to them, a remedy which may oft and eafily be had; or (in a civill way) because a Parliament, which is remedium efficacissimum, is not alwayes sitting, therefore not to make use of the benefit of inferior Courts: And yet the complaint may there possibly be as grievous as our Brethren here put the

case

case; if a Person, by an inferior Judge or Corporation condemned to die, when he hath greatest need of a relief, shall think with himself, There is yet a more efficacious remedy, (a Parliament) which both by the Law of God and man is more able to relieve me, and Lo It Is Not. Yea, and in our Brethrens owne way; if a Church, after recourse had, first to one, or more neighbour Churches, then to all in that Province or Nation, shall remaine as unsatisfied as before; they may as well bewaile themselves, that there is yet a further course of having recourse to an Elective Oecume-call Synod, which they might, by Christs Institution have recourse note, and Loe It Is Not, it cannot be had.

#### The Answer to their Third Argument.

Their third Argument is thus framed: That Church-power, which cannot shew a set and constant Divine Rule for its Variation, and Subordination, and Ultimate Independency, is not of God, and so may not be; But this variation of Church power into these Subordinations cannot shew any such

steady and confrant rule for these things, Ergo.

a Ans. First, To their Major. If by a set and constant rule, they mean by a particular & expresse rule; we deny it; It is not necessary that there be a particular expresse rule for the locall bounds or circumstantiall variations in Government. If they mean, the generall rules of the Word, applyed and made use of, with the help of Frudence and Natures light;

we grant it, and it helps not their cause.

And as to the proof of their Major, That God did never constitute a Church, but he gave the Bounds of it, That the change from Family Government to Nationall Government, amongst the Jewes, was by Goals appointment, That in the New Testament there is a Reed to measure the Temple. We say, That God never did, either in the Constitution or Alteration of Jewish Church Government or any other, set out by particular exprese Rules, all the Circumstantiall variations of it, such as our Brethren require of us. And that of measuring the Temple with a Reed, proves no fuch thing; for whether that be meant of Gods Seperating the Invisible Saints from the Antichristian Apostacy, and preserving them during Antichrilts reigne; or of restoring his Church againe after that time (as men use to measure the ground they intend to build upon;) or comprehend an order for the Government of the visible Politicall Church, as our Brethren would have it, (which we need not stand now to inquire into;) yet it no wayes holds out all locall and Circumstantiall variations; which God bath no where determined either in the Old or New-Teltament. but left things of that nature under generall rules.

Xx3

2. To their Minor we Answer, 1. That it is as much against their way as ours; All that they can say for the setting out the bounds of Particular Congregations and Elective Synods, will not amount to an expresse particular rule for all circumstantiall variations. All that which they lay for the Bounds of a PARTICULAR CONGREGATION (in their Reasons against our alledging, Act. 15. for proof of this proposition) is no more but this, such as live so, as conveniently to meet in one place, (which yet perhaps will hardly agree with the bounds of some of their Congregations;) but whether they must be threescore, fourscore, one hundred, two hundred, or a hundred ninety and nine, or more or lesse; whether they must all live within one mile, two miles, three miles compasse. or more or lesse, or may live twenty, thirty, fourty miles or more a funder, (as is seen in some Congregations now adayes;) whether a thousand persons should be divided into three or four, or five, or more, or fewer Congregations; and whether this or that man must joyne himselfe to this or that, or a third Congregation; what is there in all these particulars, and many more, that must determine it, but Generall Rules of the Word, and principles of Prudence, and the light of Nature, as may best stand with convenience and edification? And for the Bounds of ELE-CTIVE SYNODS, when a Church stands in need of Advice or Arbitration, there is nothing in the Word of God to determine particularly, whether they must go out to This or That, or a Third Church first: or, whether to One, or More at once; Or, if not satisfied upon the first Advise, whether they may goe out a Second, a Third, a Fourth time; or how Often, or, to how Many Churches; Or, if One Church be offended with the practice of a great Many Churches, whether they may, or must call them All to Account one by one, or two, three, four, or more at once, and how often they may, or must so doe; Or, if Many Churches be offended with the practices of One Church, whether each of them fingly must call that Church to an account, or two, three, four, or more together; & whether after account given to some of these Churches, they may a fecond, a third, a fourth time be called to give an account to others: There is nothing in all these cases, that can afford a partienlar expresse set standing Rule to proceed by, but onely as by the Generall Rules of Scripture, the Light of Nature, and Principles of Prudence, shall appear most to conduce to Edification, determining Controversies, removing Offences, preserving of Peace, &c. the very same Rules by which we must go in determining the Bounds, Number, Frequency, Gradations of Synods. For, that Synods Ought to be, or at least May be, (which is all our Proposition asserts) we prove: That such Churches, and such a Number Should affociate, as may most Conveniently and Orderly be

be united for the best effecting of those ends for which Synods we appointed, is but the Generall Rule of Scripture: That they be Provinciall, Nationall, &c. is according to the different occasions and conditions of times and places; and are to be fet up, bounded, circumstantiated, as may be most for Edification, and according to the Prudent consent and agreement of the Churches, together with the help and power of the Christian Magistrate when it may be had: And as in other Bodies Politick, Navies, Armies, &c. their Subordinations are cast for the good of the whole: So should it be in the Church of Christ, which being the most perfect Republiske, doth comprehend in it what loever is excellent in all other See Robin-Bodyes Politicke.

Sons Instif. · of Separat.

Next we examine our Brethrens Confirmation of their Minor; where- pag. 113. in they go about to remove all things which they suppose to be the Square of framing these Subordinations; not qua greater number of Churches, not quâ in one Kingdome, not quâ in one Nation. Wherein they labour in vaine, while they take paines to remove those particulars which were in the Debate disclaimed in the Assembly, from being the square of framing these Subordinations; and in the meane time give no reasons to overthrow that which then was, and now is, plainly owned as the Rule on which we proceed. Yet fince they please to infilt upon those particulars, and that the particulars of themselves, be of some weight (cateris paribus) in order to a determination in point of Convenience, Prudence, Edification, &c. though not sufficient, absolutely to determine what ever else may counterbalance them; we shall follow them in it.

First they say, Not qua greater number of Churches, For then 1. there must be as many severall Subordinations, as there can be supposed variati-

ons of Greater Numbers.

Ans. We say not, qua greater number simply (for then a Nationall Synod of one Kingdome, confisting of a greater number, should binde a Nationall Synod of another Kingdome consisting of a lesser number) but, as the greater number of Churches So combined and associated for such ends: As in a Congregation, or Congregationall Eldership our Brethren will not fay, that the Greater number, quâ Greater, doth bind the Lesser, but the greater number of them So United.

2. And whereas they demand, where have we a Promise that God will be more present with a Greater Part of them that PROFESSE CHRISTI-ANITY, then with a Few? We aske, Where God hath promised to be more present with the greater part of a CONGREGATION, then with a

Few.

Few, hippose two or three gathered together in his Name? Or, where have we a promise that God will be more present with an ELECTIVE SYNOD of many Churches, then with the Elders of a single Congregation? Or, where have we a promise, that upon a second reference God will be more present then upon a first reference? Yet they tell us afterwards. that when offences are not healed, and one reference to other Churches is not Sufficient to cure them, there should be a seeking to others. We are not to prescribe God how much he shall be present with his Servants in such or fuch a way: But either we may expect, that God, who promifeth to be present with every of his Servants, will be more present with more of them: Or else, that the Wisedome and Graces of Many of his Servants in his way, will with the same affiftance, better do the work, then the wisdome and graces of a fem, for God ordinarily works by meanes, (and if it were not so, we might as well refer matters of greatest consequence, and difficulty to a Few as to many, to Weak persons, as to wife and difcreet, upon this ground, Where have we a promise of Gods greater presence with the one then the other?) Or, when God calls to a greater worke, we may expect greater affistance: Or at least, we are to doe our duty, in ordering of Meanes, so as may be proportionate to their ends; and trust God to be more or leffe present as he pleaseth; and

lawfull Meanes; else why should we rather incounter an Enemy, with a whole Army, then with a single Brigade or Regiment?

3. Whereas they adde, That the greater number of Churches prof sling Religion, are more corrupt, and it had been ill for Philadelphia to be juyned in affociation with Laodicea, or the Calvinists in Germany with the Luthe. rans. We Answer; If all Numbers of men that will call themselves a Church, must therefore be admitted into an affociation (how Corrupt or Hereticall soever) we grant such an inconvenience might follow: And so (say we) it would be in a Congregation, if all be promiscuously admitted to power in it; for the greater number of Persons that pretend to professe Religion, are more corrupt: and yet can they alledge no better reason for excluding any true CHRISTIAN from their CHURCH-COMMUNION, then we for leaving any true Church out of Associ-ATION: yea, they professe as much in their Apol. Narration, pag. 12.9. That their Rule of judging in admitting of members is of that latitude, as to take in any the meanest, in whom there may be supposed to be the least of Christ: and their Rule for casting out of fellowship (by Excommunication) is for no other kinde of fins, then may evidently be presumed to be perpetrated against the parties known light; as if in manners and conversation, such as is committed against the Light of Nature, or the common received

may, upon Gods generall promises, expect a Blessing upon the use of all

ceived practices of Christianity, professed in all the Churches of Christ; or if in Opinions, then such as are likewise contrary to the Received Principles of Christianity, and the power of Godlinesse, professed by the party himself, and universally acknowledged in all the rest of the Churches; and no other sins. And if our Brethren walking by this rule, can be yet in a sufficient measure be secured, that the greater number of PERSONS in some of their Congregations may not be the more corrupt, and prejudice those that are more pure; surely we may then hope, that if our Synods be made up of such Elders as are described, I Tim. 3. and Tit. 1. (to which a tender respect is to be had) me may in a good measure avoid that danger. But there is farre more danger in our Brethrens way; for if an Erroneous hereticall Congregation may (electively, as our Brethrens speak) choose their own sudges, we have little reason to believe, but that they will choose either some at all, or such as they know before-hand, are likely to be of their own sudgement.

4. Say our Brethren, suppose there be as many Elders and Churches more purely reformed in one Province, as in the rest of the Nation besides; why should not God be thought to be as much with them, as with the Natio-

nall Assembly?

Ans. So he may, (God may be as much present possibly with one Regiment, as with the whole Army beside;) and if he be so present with them, as to enable them to doe their worke, they need not then bring it to the Nationall ensurement; yet even then, the rest of the Nation may have need of Them. There may possibly be, as many Able Knowing Christians in some one Family, as in all the rest of a Congregation, yet this hinders not their associating into one Church.

5. Say they, If qua greater, then the Decrees of GENERALL COUNCELS in former Ages, (even those that set up Bishops and Popes) should binde us more then PROVINCIALL or NATIONAL SYNODS nom, at least till repealed by another Generall Councell. As Acts of Parliament

made by our Auncestors, bind us till repealed.

Ans. 1. The Assembly hath not yet debated the Power of Generall Councells in making Laws, much lesse of their binding after-Ages.

2. Nor doe we say, that Countells (either one or other) doe binde absolutely, what ever their decrees be: But when they Erre, they are no otherwise binding, then as Erring Eldership.

3. Nor do the Decrees of thole Councels binde Us, except vi materia, who were not in Association with those Churches, nor were either actu-

ally or virtually confenting to them.

4. Nor do we grant that such Generall Councels had a like Legislative tower for these Churches, as the Parliament hath for the Kingdome.

Yy

Next

Next, say our Brethren, The Bounds and Limits of Assemblies being Ecclesiasticall, must not have their rise from Nationall or Politicall respects.

Antioch sent to Jerusalera, not of the same Province or Nation, rather then

Syria, or Cilicia.

Ans. 1. We doe not bring Acts 15. for a pattern of a Synod, either Provinciall or Nationall, as Such; but as an instance of Churches associated in a Synod: And if not within the same either Province or Nation, then doth it give warrant for Association of Churches, even beyond the bounds of one Nation.

2. We doe not say, quâ Province, quâ Nation, quâ Kingdome; but, as upow a due weighing of these and other particulars shall appear most for the

good of the Church.

But we fay, 3. That the Churches in one Kingdome, (having more communion with each other, then with Churches of another Kingdome) are (ordinarily) fittest to associate, and to be most immediately helpfull one to another.

4. We say, that the concurrent affishance or opposition of the State and Magistrate, may make Associations, either in the same Nation, or with other Nations, more or lesse expedient; and variation in expediency may cause a variation in the Boundings and Limits of Synods.

And for that question, why Antioch sent not to the Churches of Syria and Cilicia, rather then to Jerusalem, which was neither in the same Pro-

vince nor Nation?

We Answer; Whether it were, 1. Because that Aram or Spria being so large and vast, containing not only Calosyria, in which Antioch was, but also Mesopotamia, Phanicia, and some other regions: And Cilicia likewife (of which Tarfus was the Metropolis) being very large, (and to which Antioch did not belong, either as a Province or Nation, as our Brethren seeme to suppose;) those Churches could either not at all, or not so conveniently, or not so some be gathered into a Synod: Or, 2. Because those Churches being troubled with the same Errours (as it appears they were) and stood in need, as well as Antioch, of seeking the advise and helpe of other Churches: Or, whether 3. Those Churches being but new planted, were not yet formed into such Subord nations: Or, whether 4. Those Churches had already met in Synods, and the debates and refults at Antioch, were the debates and refults not of One Church, but of a Synod of Elders from severall of those Churches, and yet unable to determine that controversie; (for 1. Others, beside Paul and Barnabas were sent to ferufalem: And 2. other Churches were troubled with these Errours, and their troubles represented to the Synod at ferusalem:

lem: And 3. the Returne made, and Letters directed to those Other Churches, to the Churches of Antioch, Syria and Cilicia: And 4. Indas and Silas Sent to Them with these Letters; and yet, when the Letters are delivered and read at Antioch, the Messengers set downe and make their abode There, as having performed their whole trust, without further travelling about Syria, and Cilicia, though the Brethren of Syria and C.I.cia, as well as those of Antioch, are told in these Letters, that together With Paul and Barnabas, they had fent Judas and Silas To THEM, Who should tell them the same things, by mouth:) Or, whether 5. for some other reason; We are not able positively to determine. Onely, in generall; we say, The Reason why they had Recourse unto, or did Associate with the Church at Ferusalem, (and perhaps those of Judea too) for making Decrees (in matter of common concernment) obligatory to all those Churches of Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia; was, Because this did appear the most Expedient and Conducing for those ends, of Edifying those Churches, Composing their Differences, and Removing their Errors. And the same rule are We to observe in our Associations.

And as to that, of the Kingdome of Ifrael, breaking into Two Kingdomes, While yet the Church-state in their Subordinations altered not. We

Answer,

1. Whether it did, or did not, is not much materiall to our purpose; For we doe not say, That the Bounds of a Kingdome, quâ Kingdome, must be the Bounds of an Association (but that there may be Associations larger and lesser then of one Kingdome;) but, That this is one particular, considerable amongst others in point of Expediency and Edification.

2. As for those Services, which by Gods appointment, were to be done onely at Jerusalem, the reason is plaine of their not altering, because there was but one Jerusalem, the onely place which God had chosen to put his name there: But that nothing concerning the local Bounds, or other Circumstances belonging to their Government, admitted variation upon that Change, is more then our Brethren can prove.

To what they next adde, that If this INDEPENDENCY arise from the Magistrates, then there is no need of such subordinations, because (in experience) Reformed Churches abroad are well enough governed without these Subordinations; Geneva hath no Appeals, having but one Classis, and why may not other Churches be governed as well without them, if the Magistrate oversee them, and keep each to their duties; The Churches in the Low-countries want Nationall Synods; and yet are peaceably Governed; yea, some of them are without Provinciall, and say, if they can, they will never have more. We Answer,

1. If the Churches in Geneva, and the Low-Countries be WELL ENOUGH governed, then are Churches under a PRESBYTERIAL GOVERNMENT well enough Governed: Yea, then is there no need of ELECTIVE SYNODS, for those Churches have none.

2. We plead not for INDEPENDENCY, but for a Subordination

upon Association, when it may be had.

3. Our question is not about the Power of the Magistrate, but about an Ecclesiastick obligation, by vertue of Church-principles, such as might have agreed to the primitive Churches before the Magistrate was Christian, as our Brethren themselves have noted.

4. If Geneva doe not altogether affociate with those under another Civill Government, lest perhaps, they might prejudice their civill liberties; or for some other inconvenience which may over-balance it; yet they doe affociate with the Reformed Churches of France, as much as they can, and fend Commissioners to their Nationall Synods: And Beza hath

been President in some of them.

- 5. If the Low-Countries Want Nationall Synods, why doe our Brethren say, they are well enough Governed without them? If by Want, they doe not imply a Need of them, but, that they have them not: then is it not true: For in the Low-Countries they have Nationall Assemblies, though of late there have bin some interruptions in their meetings. and they have not, as formerly, met every three year. And the seldome meeting, either of their Nationall or Provinciall Synods is their prejudice, not their gaine; and an affliction of spirit to their godly Pastors and People. But whereas our Bretbren adde, that some (Churches) of them, say, If they can, they will never have more: We know that the Socinians and Arminians have complained of Synods, and laboured with all their might, to hinder the convening of them; but that Others, at least, that other Churches have so said; we doe no more believe, then we doe what hath been said by some others, That some of them have desired the Episcopall Government; nor are bound to answer for the one, more then for the other.
- 6. But let it be granted, That some Reformed Churches, (which could not have them) have not had all these sorts of Assemblies; it doth not follow, that therefore, those who can have them, must yet forbear. Some Churches have not Ruling Elders, some Churches have no Elective Synods; yet our Brethren will not say, that therefore No Churches may have them.

In the last place, say our Brethren; As not from Politicall, so neither from Nationall respects, are these bounds to be fetched; For then 1. the Calvinists

vinists in Germany, must be subject to a greater number of Lutherans; and all Ministers in England must associate, of which the greater number will be the worse: Or, if because the Calvinists professe a further Resormation, they be disobliged from such an Association, then so are those, who in a Nation professe a further Resormation: And Uniformity of principles is a more intimate bond of such Association, then such extrinsecal respects. 2. If quâ Nation or Principality, then Wales must be Independent. 3. If quâ Nation of the same tongue or kindred, then must the scattered sews have made one Church distinct, from those with whom they did cohabite. Or 4. If quâ Nation or People, dwelling within the same Nationall bounds, then must those sews make up one Church with those Nations; whereas Peter, James, and Paul to the Hebrews writes to them apart, as Churches in all Nations.

Ans. These are but light exceptions. For 1. Though the Churches in a Nation be bound to associate, if they can; yet not qua one Nation, (that respect of Nation or Principality, being extrinsecall to the Church, and accidentall) but qua such a number, and in such bounds, as may be most conveniently joyned for the best improvement of Synodicall Government.

2. Not doe we say, All Ministers must promiscuously be admitted as members in Synods, no more then that, All pretended Christians may be

admitted to all Church-Communion in Congregations,

3. Nor doe we deny, but Uniformity in Principles ought, among other things, to be duly weighed in reference to Association; (and our Brethren might as well have shewed their Reasons, why That may not be a rule to be made use of in Associations, as those that they have singled out;) And our Brethren know that the reason why the best Resormed Churches in Germany (which our Brethren call Calvinists) doe not Associate with the Lutherans, (though they doe admit amicable conferences and debates with them) is, Because of the great differences between them, not only about Church Government, but in meighty Points of Dostrine.

4. Yet we do not say, That a bare Profession of a Further Reformation, will disobline from Association; nor doe we believe our Brethren will say it; for, by the same reason, they must say, that if some of their own members professe a further Reformation, they may, thereupon, di-

vide from them.

5. That of Wales, hurts not us; for if they may conveniently Associate, their being a distinct principality, will not hinder it: If by reason of their Language, or the like, they cannot; yet this hinders not, but that they, who can, may Associate: Their supposed Independency toucheth not us, who hold no Independency.

Y y 3

6. The dispersed sewes (for any thing our Brethren can shew to the contrary) might be associated with those Churches amongst which they did cohabite, (Christ having taken away the disference between Jew and Gentile:) And, for ought we know, when Paul wrote to all the Churches in Galatia, as one lump, They might be comprehended with the rest: Sure we are, that the Errours in the Churches of Galatia about Circumcision, and other fewish rites, were too much associated with the Errours of Jews, who lived among them: And is so, then Peter writing to the dispersed Jews in Galatia, &c. did not write to them, as a distinct Church not associated. And we think our Brethren cannot well say the contrary, unlesse they intend to grant, That in the Church of Ephesus (to say nothing of other Churches) there were at least Two Congregations, one of Jews, another of Greeks; for that there were in Ephesus, both fews and Greeks, we believe they will not deny.

#### The Answer to their Fourth Argument.

Their Fourth Argument lies thus, That Government which necessarily produceth representations of spirituall power, out of other representations, with a derived power there-from, there is no warrant for: But these Subordinations of Synods, Provinciall, Nationall, Occumenicall, for the Government of the Church, doe so. For if all Churches in the severall Provinces be subject to the Nationall Assembly, and all, in severall Nations to an Occumenicall, then must they all be interessed in that Nationall or Occumenicall Affembly, and involved in it, as the Shires are involved in the Parliamentary power. Which interest must arise, either by an immediate choice (as Parliament men are chosen immediately by those they represent) which cannot be here, for the Congregations of a Province do not meet for such choice of those, who shall represent them in the Nationall Assembly: Or else those chosen by the Congregations to represent them in the Provinciall Assembly, choose some few of themselves to represent them in the Nationall; and some of the Nationall Assembly to represent them all in the Oecumenicall. Which may not be, both because there is no warrant for any delegated power at all in firituall matters, all ministers being immediately Christi vicarii ; and because representations, as reflexions, grow still weaker, the higher they go, and are but a shadow of the first shadow: Yet the whole power that can be supposed to belong to the whole substance, is ascribed to them. But if thefe few, in a Generall or. Nationall Councell binde all those Nations or Provinces under them: Then 1. They must be supposed to have a promise and affishance answerable; not only so Indice as Elders, which is their Office; and according to their Personall Abilities being thus called to

give

give their advise, (which two are granted;) but such a superadded assistance as holds proportion to that spirituall bulk and kody which they represent: And such is twice intimated to be with the Sanedrim, Deut. 17. Thou shalt goe to the place which God shall chuse, and doe according to the sentence which they shall show. 2. They have each of them in such an assembly, a power parallel to that of Bishops, and Arch-bishops, who challenge in Councels to represent their Churches. 3. They must then be a Church, and a body to Christ, which they are not.

Anf. 1. We cannot but observe, that our Brethren doe neither content themselves with the Question as stated by the Assembly, (who being to advise concerning a Church Government for this Kingdome, speak nothing of a Subordination to Otenmenick Councels;) nor yet are constant to their own stating it, but sometimes (as in their third Argument) dispute against the Assembly, as denying such Subordination, and call for proof of an ultimate Independency in a Nationall Synod; and sometimes (as in this Argument) they dispute against Sabordination to Occumenick Councels, as if the Proposition had afferted it.

2. We observe that neither this, nor any of the sormer Arguments, are framed against the Subordination of Congregationall and Classicall Assemblies, to Synods, (which the Proposition assirmes) but onely of Synods amongst them elves, Provinciall to Nationall, and both to Occume-

nicall; the latter of which the proposition meddles not with.

3. For Answer; we say, that when severall Churches send choice men to act thus in a Classis; and severall Classes send choice men to Provinciall Synods, and they to a Nationall. These Representations are not (as our Brethren suppose) shadows of shadows, but as Gold extracted out of Gold, which the oftner it is refined, the purer it is; or as Chymicall extractions, whereof the last and highest is the most strong and precious.

4. And some Representations of this nature our Brethren cannot deny,

both in their single Congregations, and in their Elective Synods. For

I. In their Congregations, All have not authority to vote, as women and children; yet because the Church is said to doe it, and All (women as well as others) are obliged, the Voters must necessarily Represent the Whole Church: And when any of those, who have power to vote, are Absent, (which cannot be avoided, by reason of sicknesse, or the like, especially if persons dwelling at 40 miles distance, or more, are yet standing members of a Congregation) the Present Voters must Represent those Represent of these must Represent them All.

2. And when these Representers send any of their Delegates to Act and Vote in an Elective Synod, these Delegates doe represent all the former Representers; and why may not ten Churches meet to delegate some from them All, and send them to a Synod of an hundred Churches, as well as Antioch send from that one Church to ferusalem?

5. Nor doth this at all hinder it, That they are immediately Christi Vicarii: For though the power of such an office be immediately from Christ, yet the designing of such a Person to that Office, and Imploying him, hic Gnunc, to preach the Word, or performe such an act of Government, for the good and edification of those that send him, is not immediately

from Christ.

6. But here we must observe likewise, that our Brethren dispute not against the Subordination or power of these Synods, or the standing use of them, but against the Being of them; and not of these onely but of their owne Elective Synods; for how can a Church or Churches goe forth Electively to one Elective Synod of all the Churches in a Province, a Nation; yea, of all the world, (as our Brethren grant they may) without representations, yea, representations of representations? For we doe not believe their meaning to be thus; that if ten Churches see cause to goe forth for light, to all the Churches of a Province or Nation, by way of an Elective Synod; then all, and every member of these ten Churches must in person repair to a meeting of all the members of those Churches in a Province or Nation in one body.

As to that Demand of our Brethren; Where is there a promise of such an Assistance as holds proportion with the Whole Nation? We Answer: The Fromise of Christ is One and the Same to All the Officers; from the Apostles to the Pastor and Teacher; I will be with you alwayes, to the end of the world: And Where two or three are gathered together in my name; there am I in the midst of them: Which he useth to make good in proportion to the worke he sets them upon. He doth not give a distinct Provile to each Officer, (I will be present with an Apostle in such a proportion, with an Evangel ft in such a proportion, and with a Pastor or Elder in such a proportion;) much lesse doth he give speciall promises to each Act belonging to the same Office, (I will be thus far present with a Puffor in teaching, thus far in visiting the sieke, thus far in admonishing, reproving, comforting, thus far in ruling his own Congregation, and thus far when called to governe or advise in reference to other Congregations: ) but That one Promise is sufficient ground for each Officer, in every act of his Office to expect a Bleffing proportionable to the Work he is imployed in. Nor will our Brethren we beleeve, undertake to produce a

speciall promise; How far Christ will be present with an Elective Synode, more then he was with the Church or Churches that repair to them; or How much more he will be present with a Synod of ten Churches then of two.

But if our Brethren think, that if a company of Ministers be sent to a Synod, in the name of so many Churches, or to represent those Churches, or the Ministers in them; they must be then looked upon, as having All the Light, Graces, Gifts, and Consciences of all those Churches, and must have as large Affiftance from God, as if they had so: We acknowledge no such representation as this, either in, or out of Synods; and therefore need not seeke for a promise of such assistance. If a Minister, as the Mouth of the people, indite and utter a prayer to God in their name, or on their behalf; though in so doing, he may be said to represent the people, (as well, as when the Priests offered up sacrifices in the behalf, either of the people, or of particular persons;) he is not yet looked upon, as having All the gifts and graces of that people, whose mouth he is, and an Assistance answerable; but is to imploy That Light and Grace, and Ability, that Christ hath bestowed on Him for their good; (And so, if he pray to God in the behalf of an absent Person, a Church, a Kingdome:) And in the like manner mult he doe, when in a Sy NOD (Provinciall, Nationall, or Oecumenicall) he acts in the name, and for the good of such Churches, by special Delegation or Appointment of him to that purpose.

Nor was it otherwise in the High Priests offering sacrifices, or making Atonement for the Whole People; who was not therefore to be looked upon, as having Gifts and Graces equal to those of the Whole People, (though the Sacrifices there offered, and the Atonement made, were Accepted for the Whole;) no more then if a King, or fingle Minister should make Prayers to God, in the behalf of his Kingdome or Congregation, and be Heard in such requests. Neither was the Sanedrim to be looked upon, as having All the Grace, Justice, Wisdome of the whole Nation, though they were by Gods appointment the highest Court; but onely an Asistance sutable to the work which God called them to: Nor will the Text alledged out of Dent. 17. (where they are bid to go up to the place which God shall choose, and to doe according to the sentence which they shall shew) prove more. And so far is that from making against what we affert, that it makes much for us: For though the Place (Jerusalem) and the Person (the High Priest) were Typicall, and so ceased; yet the Businesse it self, (of hearing Appeales, redressing Injuries, expediting of difficult cases, &c.) are things of a Morall nature, and there is the like need of provision for them now, as there was then.

ZZ

As to what they next adde, That this makes them in these Assemblies so many Arch bishops or Bishops: We Answer, No more then every Elder in one of our Brethrens Congregations joyning in the Presbytery may be judged Popes in their owne parish; nor so much neither, as might be easily shewed if it were needfull to make Retortions of this nature. But we have often spoken to this comparison, which our Brethren so much delight in; though yet they would not take it well to be so often told, How near their way comes (and in how many principles) to that of Brownists or Anabaptists; and, What might be said more plausibly for Brownists Tenents wherein they differ, then for Theirs. Yea, and themselves acknowledging Elective Synods of Elders, who may (authoritatively) Teach, and Declare men Subverters of the faith, Fit to be excommunicated, &c. would not yet be willing to be charged to set up so many Bishops or Arch-Bishops in those branches of Authority which Bishops challenge to themselves.

To their last exception, That if these representations having the power of all the Churches in the Nation be warrantable, they must be a Church, and a lody to Christ, &c. We Answer, (as often times in this case) That we doe not enquire for Names, but Things. That there may be Synods thus collested, our Brethren doe not deny; but say, they are usefull for finding out, and declaring of truth in difficult cases, for healing offences, &c. whether they will say such a Synod is a Church, or is a Body to Christ, we will not contend; if They may be so called, then so may the Synods we contend for; if not, then their Arguments hurts not us more then themselves, for then (by this Argument) neither are their Synods warrantable. But their Consequence will no way follow; for our Brethren assert often, That every Apostle had the power of all Churches, not onely in a Nation, but in the WOR LD, and their acts did oblige them to Subjection: Yet will not our Brethren say, That every Apostle is a Church, or is so called, or is a Body to Christ. And in every of their Congregations, where they suppose the Elders and Brethren, without the women and children, have the whole Church-power; we need but turne their words upon themselves, If these representers (Elders and Brethren, without the women and children) having the power of all the persons in that Congregation, were warrantable, they must be a Church; Now, besides that they are no where so called, if they were called so, then they are a Body to Christ, for so every Church is, and where is Christ Said to have a representative Body of his Body? And yet so they must be, or they have not the power of all the memters of that Church in them, nor othermife doe their acts oblige them to subjection: And when our Bre. have thought of an Answer in this this case, we doubt not but they may see the same Answer will serve our turne. That the Elders and Brethren without the women and children are a Church, we suppose they will not say; for if so, then either the women and children are of no Church, or of another Church; that they are of no Church we believe they will not say; nor can they say, that they are of another Church, unlesse they will say, that one Church governs another, that the Church of Elders and Brethren, governs the Church of women and children: If they say, That the Elders and Brethren, together with the women and children make but One Church; and yet, though the momen and children act not, yet the Church is said to act thus and thus, when those in the Church doe thus act, who have authority and commission so doe; we say so to: And then the question will be this, Not whether those who act are a Church; but Who those are in the Church that ought to act.

# The Answer to our Brethrens Reasons, a-gainst the allegation of Acts 15. for the Subordination of Synods, Provinciall, Nationall, Occumenicall.

E cannot but wonder to see our Brethren so frequently run upon grosse mistakes, and mis-recitings of our Propositions and Proofes. We say nothing in any of our Propositions concerning Subordination to OE CUMENICK Synods, but only of Congregationall, Clasficall, Provinciall, and Nationall Affemblies amongst themselves; but instead of Congregationall and Classicall, our Brethren adde Oecumenicall: Nor did we alledge Acts 15. for a proof of any Subordination at all: nor so much as for the being of Provinciall or Nationall Assemblies, as such, but onely for the Lawfulnesse of SYNODS; (That the Scrip:ure holdeth forth another fort of Assemblies for the Government of the Church, beside Congregationall and Classicall, which we call Synodicall; ) a Proposition to which our Brethren entred no Diffent, nor (so far as we can remember) did give any negative Vote. For, That there are Synods held forth in Scripture, our Brethren grant; (and That they are an holy Ordinance of God;) & That they are proved by this place: but, whether Provincia all, Nationall, Occumenicall; whether Standing, and Subordinate; or Occasionall, and Elective; whether to Excommunicate, or to Advise, &c. that Proposition speaks not. So that this Text is brought by us to prove

ZZ 2

172 The Answer of the Assembly of Divines unto the Reasons of

no more then what they acknowledge to be truth, and what they affirme to be proved from it.

But say they, this one example cannot prove both Presbyteries and Synods,

but if we lean to the one, we must quit the other.

Ans. 1. Nor is it brought by us to prove both: We brought it before to prove, that the Elders of Jerusalem did performe acts of Government over more Congregations then one; and it is brought now to prove the Lawfulnesse of Synods, which may both very well stand together.

2. At least, some passages in this Chapter may prove the one, and some the other, without any inconsistence. 3. Yea further, if it be sufficient to prove, that Churches, at so great a distance, may joyne in a Synod; it will prove a fortiori, that neighbour Churches may joyn in a Classis.

They say further, That this Assembly, Acts 15. was not a formall Synod, but onely a reference by the particular Church of Antioch, to the particular

Church of Jerusalem.

Ans. Whether either Antioch or ferusalem were a particular Church, (in our Brethrens sense) or, whether this reference were made onely from Antioch, and not from any other Church or Churches assembled there, either in a Classis or a Synod, it is not needfull now to dispute: Nor whether this meeting at ferusalem were a formall Synod. Our Brethren grant, That a Synod is an holy Ordinance of God; and That it may be proved from this place: But whether the instance be a formall Synod, or onely a sufficient warrant for a Synod, is to our purpose all one.

But say our Brethren; If it had been a Synod, yet 1. Neither Provinciall nor Nationall.

Ans. 1. Nor doe we say that it was a Provincial or Nationall Synod; But, though it were neither Provincial nor Nationall, yet it might be a Synod; which is enough to our purpose, who bring this, onely to prove,

That there may be Synods.

2. If (according to our Brethrens Principles) this meeting, though formally not a Synod, might yet be a sufficient warrant for a Synod, (yea, for a multiplicity of Synods, in case the first Synod be not able to do the work) then this Synod, though it were not formally either Provinciall or Nationall, may yet be a sufficient warrant for both: For if we be bound precisely to follow this example, in All the Circumstances of it, without any circumstantiall variation, then cannot our Brethren approve of Elective Formall Synods under colour of this example, which,

fay

fay they, was not a Formall Synod: Nor may they, in case the first Elective Synod doe not satisfie, have recourse to a second, (which yet here they say, they may) because those of Antioch rested in this first resolution.

They adde, Neither 2. was it a standing Synod, (Which the Word Subordination doth imply) but Elective; and that, but for this one Inestion without obligation to referre All other matters to them in an ordinary way.

Ans. 1. Our Brethren should not dispute against the Subordination of Synods in this place; For Alls 15. was not by us brought to prove the

Subordination, but the Being of Synods.

2. Nor doth the word Subordination prove, that they must needs be STANDING Synods; more then the Subordination of Inferiour Courts to the Parliament, proves that the Parliament must needs be a

Standing Court and not Occasionall.

3. Nor is there such a materiall difference between Standing Synods and Occasionall, in regard either of their Lamfulnesse, or their Power: unlesse our Brethren think, that a Trienniall or Standing Parliament be Substantially different, in point of lawfulnesse and power, from Occasionall Parliaments, and that, though the sundamental Laws of a Kingdome should warrant the One, yet they would not therefore warrant the Other. We know not, but that Occasionall and Standing Synods are of the like Divine Authority; and our Brethren have as yet made very little Objection against it. Nor doe those of New-England make any such difference; see Cottons Keyes, pag. 48. Answer to 32. questions, pag. 64.

They adde, Nor 3. was there a Multiplicity of Synods, but onely one, in whole Judgement those of Astrioch rested, 4. Much lesse a Contignati-

on of Synods, Superiour and inferiour.

Ans. Yet say our Brethren in the next words; when offences are not healed, and one reference to other Churches is not sufficient to cure them, there should be a seeking to others: so that this Instance of One, is a sufficient warrant for a Multiplicity, by their own grant: (And if the first Synod be able to dispatch the businesse, we doe no more plead for a needlesse carrying it further, then themselves doe.) But in case there be reason after the first Reference or Appeal, to whom should they next goe? The Text is wholly silent; there is nothing for direction, but Generall Rules of Scripture, together with principles of Prudence, and the Light of Nature, to judge of what is most for convenience.

Zz 3 Order,

### 174 The Answer of the Assembly of Divines, unto the Reasons of

Order, and Edification; which all will perswade rather to seeke higher, then lower: And not we only (with other reformed Churches) but Mr. Cotton, with the Divines of New-England, do argue from hence, by a parity of reason, for a Contignation, even to an Oecumenicall Councell, as upon a Morall and Perpetuall ground. But, Whether this associating must needs be of Neighbour Churches, and, Whether of All Churches promiscuously without election; hath been spoken to before. Whether they have power to bind sub pana (as our Brethren speake) pertaines not to this question, either about the Being of Synods, or of their Subordination; nor do our Brethren here object against it.

But because our Brethren insist on this, that Synods must be ELE-

CTIVE; we shall speake somewhat more to it.

If by Elective, they had meant, an Association of Churches who meet in a Synod, by their owne mutuall consent and choice, to determine, and manage matters of difficulty, &c. there had been no difference between us; We thinke that Churches should voluntarily agree into such Associations, as well as Persons ought voluntarily to associate into Congregations, so as may be most for generall edification: yet is not the one nor the other a matter of choice, but of Duty.

But by Election, our Brethren meane, a Reference made by a particular Church, whose the businesse is, to some other Church or Churches of their owne choosing, and They to deale in it, only so far, as they Refer their

businesse unto them.

To which we fay,

1. That we thinke our Brethren are the first that ever held out such

a kind of Synod.

2. Nor doth this place AEIs 15. on which they ground it, speake any thing of ELECTIVENESSE. It saith indeed, when there was a sides, a side or Faction in the Church that taught Errours against the Doctrine of Paul and Barnabas, the Church concludes that Paul and Barnabas with others of them should goe to Jerusalem; But no mention, that it was meerely at their owne choice, whether to serd or not to send, or whether to Jerusalem or any other Churches, and about what questions they pleased, and no others.

3. That it should be at the choice of the Charch whose the businesse is, is to us most incongruous; partly because it crosseth another principle of our Brethrens, That neighbour Churches offended may (without their reference) call them to an account; and partly because it seemes contrary to all principles either of Nature or Scripture, that it should be in the power of the Offending party, either to choose whether he will be accountable

Be-

or no, or who alone shall be his fudges.

Besides that 4. our Brethren do not shew, in this Church that needs help, who those are that shall choose the Synod; whether both sides must agree in choice of the Arbitrators, or whether one party must shuse some and the other party choose others, (neither of which they can show in the instance;) or, in case a Church be divided, whether party shall choose, those in the right, or those that erre; if those who be in the right, yet still the question will be, who those are, for both parties pretend to it; or if the Major part of the whole, then if either all or the greater part, be in an Errour, there will either be no choise of a Synod at all, or else onely of such as will side with them in their errour, and consirme them in it. Yea, and by this meanes, that Remedy which our Brethren say is an Ordinance of God, for the removall of Offences, Scandals, Errours, will have no place at all where those prevaile, for an Erroneous Church will never make choise (if it be in their owne sole power) of such a Synod as they know will condemne them.

And whereas our Brethren make it a matter of Reference, by way of

Arbitration.

If their meaning be that this Reference doth give the Judges power and authority to determine and conclude them, as Elders, who now have authority from Christ (upon this call) to exercise the power of Elders to them; then indeed they say something; But should they say thus, then would they fall under all the Incongruities and Inconveniencies of their first Argument in their former Paper; Then must these Elders stand related to them as Their Church, for Church and Elders are Relata, Then must they be chosen by them, Ordained by them, Maintained by them; Then must they Preach to them as well as Rule them; Then must they visit their

fick, &c. as our Brethren there argue.

If their meaning be but this, That those to whom it is referred, may now declare their Judgement upon the case, hold out Light to them, exhort them to follow their Advice, but have no farther authority: All this they might have done Before, or Without any such Reference made to them; Yea the neighbour Churches in the Province or Nation (whom our Brethren would not to have to take upon them the power of a Synod) may, without being called, doe thus much; and such a Synod as this would be but a Colledge of Advisers, and comes far short of the Synod Asts 15. who not onely disputed, and declared the false Teachers to be Perverters and Subverters, but MADEDECREES and LAID BURDENS upon the Churches necessary to be submitted; And that not onely on the Church of Antioch, who alone (say our Brethren) Referred the question to them, but on All the Churches in Syria and Cilicia, of whose Reference

we read nothing: And our Brethren cannot well imagine such a Reference, unlesse they grant either a Synod at Antioch, before the sending to

Ferusalem, or a Synod at ferusalem of more then two Churches.

But if our Brethren say that these Referrers have an Authoritative pomer (though not to excommunicate, yet) to Declare, Command, Protest, non-Communicate, &c. yet not as Elders, but onely by vertue of this Reference, which power before they had not; Then how can our Brethren deny all Representation or Delegation of sprituall power? for what is this but a Delegating of somewhat of that power to these Arbitrators, which was before Intirely in themselves; and that to those who (as to Them) are no Church Officers; yea not onely a giving to a Multitude of Churches joyntly to have authority over One of themselves singly, but putting an authority at their owne pleasure into the hands of one single Congregation, over another single Congregation; for a Reference may as well be made to one as to many Churches: And if they may thus delegate one part of their own power to these Arbitrators, why not another part? why not a power of excommunicating, as well as of declaring to be subverters of the Faith.

And if they may thus delegate, either all, or part of, their Church power, What is this but a forraine and extrinsick power to that Church? which they so often speake against, with leffe reason, when in Classes and Synods, the particular Church concerned is a part of those that Judge, whereas in their way the power is put quite out of their owne hands, to the Arbitrators. And if they may not be confined herein to the Churches of a Province or Netion, but must make Reference at pleasure to any Churches in the World what soever, as they list; & thereby invest those Churches, if not with compleat Church power; yet at least with a power to Indge authoritatively in Doctrines of Faith, to declare and pronounce the Churches of this Kingdome to be Hereticks, Subverters of the Fuith, perverters of Soules, and (perhaps) to make and impose decrees and lay burdens: and in all these things to be looked at and acknowledged as an Ordinance of Christ: What is this but an introducing a forraine Ecclesiasticall Jurisdiction,

which in their fecond Argument they would charge upon us?

If our Brethren say (as sometimes they do) that in this power of making decrees, laying burdens, &c. especially as to the Churches of Syria and Cilicia, and as to those points not referred, the Apostles acted by

an Apostolick authority, and not as Elders in a Synod:

Then 1. (to fay nothing at present of the Elders joyning with them in these Decrees, even to those Churches, Acts 15. 23. and 16. 4.) we aske, How can our Brethren make this Reference to Apostses, and Decision by Apostles, as Apostles, to be a warrant for elective Synods of those

who

Who have not Apostolick power? Or how shall we know what they did

as Apostles, and what as a Synod for our imitation?

2. How can our Brethren say, that this sending to Apossles, as Apossles, was Elective? for it was not Elective to the Churches of Antioch, whether or no to make the last reference for decision in Controversies to the Apostles then living; but they were obliged then to stand to their decisions as much as we now to their writings.

3. How can our Brethren say, that it was a Reference in This case Onely, without any obligation to refer other matters at other times to their decision? For certainly they were obliged, in All matters to stand to their

decision as Apostles, as much as in this One.

4. We might adde, that if the Apostles here acted as Apostles, then (having authority as Elders in all Churches) they might not only Declare, and Censure, but even Excommunicate and exercise All Church power; And then, if what was here done, or might be done, be a precedent for Synods now, the authority of Synods will be more then what our Brethren allow them.

5. Nor had they then an authority, by vertue of this Reference, which before they had not; but onely exercised that authority which before they had.

And whereas our Brethren adde, That though this of Acts 15. were not a formall Synod, yet it holds out by a rule of equity, that offences among Charches should be referred by themselves to others who are best able to heale them; and so may be a pattern of Elective Synods: (they should have added, And that they may by other Churches be called to give account, in case of offence; for such Synods also they acknowledge.)

Ans. I. Our Brethren here resolve all into Rules of Equity: and certainly the rules of equity will as strongly plead for Subordination upon Association, as for an Arbitrary Reference, for the offending party to choose

whether he shall be tried or no, and by what Judges.

2. If this onely be their warrant for Elective Synods, then we leave them to answer their owne first argument; That such Courts as have not the Greatest and most Express warrant and assignment for them in the Word, both for their Subordination and Number, and for their Bounds and limits of Power are not to be erected in the Church of God.

Our Brethren conclude, That they have shewed sufficiently, the difference between the meeting at ferusalem, and such Synods as we contend for; and say that upon supposition that one Kingdom were governed by way of Elective Arbitration, another by way of Subordinate Courts, these are such differing formes that he who would make the first conforme to the last, should overthrow the sundamental laws of it.

Aaa ... Anfw.

Ans. Besides that, all this is sufficiently answered already; and, That this place was not by us alleadged to prove either the Subordination or Power of Synods, but onely the Being of Synods, (which our Brethren grant to be sufficiently proved from it:) We only adde, That since the Government of Christs Church, is first by brotherly Admonition, and if this prevaile not, then to cure them by Church censure, and neither in the One nor the Other the party Offending to choose his owne Judges: They who would bring it to an Arbitrary Electivene fe, so as the parties Offending may choose, who shall heare their canse, and submit no further then themselves like, Do change the Laws of Christs Kingdome.

### The Answer to our Brethrens Reasons against the Argument drawne from the Analogy of Mat. 18.

He frength of that Argument (say our Brethren) runnes, That be-Leause there Should be this remedy, therefore there Is such a Remedy. Ans. Why our Brethren should take this to be the strength of our Argument, we cannot tell: Our argument lies plainly thus: Mat. 18. proving the Subordination of a particular person offending, to a particular Church, doth by a like reason prove the Subordination of an offending Congregation to greater Assemblies: And the reason of it is, Because the Grounds, Reasons, and Ends of Subordination are the same in both, That God may be glorified, The Offender shamed, humbled, reduced, and sin not suffered to rest upon him, That others may be preserved from contagion and made to feare, That scandall and pollution of the Ordinances may be prevented or removed, &c. All which argue as strongly and fully for the Subordination of an Offending Congregation to Superior and greater Affemblies, as of an Offending Brother to a particular Congregation; for (as our Brethren often intimate) there is the same relation between

If our Brethren were asked, what course were to be taken with a Sister offending? we doubt not but they would fay, the same that Christ here proposeth in case of an offending Brother; and they would give this reason, Because there is the like reason of both, and therefore Christ supposed to intend both: And if they will then say, The strength of this reason (concerning an offending Sister) is this, Because there should be this remedy, therefore there is such a Remedy, we hope they will then allow that Argument to be a good one. And we, not doubting but that it was Christs meaning to prevent and remove scandalls as well of an offen-

Church and Church, as there is between Brother and Brother.

ding Sifter, as of an offending Brother, and of an Offending Church, or fome Number of offenders, as well as of a particular person; and that in case of publike scandals, as well as of private offences; doubt not but it was his meaning while he gives Instance in One, that the like course (mutatic mutandic) should in a due proportion be used in all the rest.

Nor is this our Argument alone, but (as others, fo) Mr. Cotton of New-England makes use of it in his Keyes, Chap. 6. (a Treatise published by two of these Brethren) Where, having spoken of one Cause of Synods, that is, when a Church desireth the helpe and councell of other Churches, as Acts 15. he addeth another distinct ground of Synods (which, faith he, just consequence from Scripture giveth us) that is, the case of any Church lying under Scandall, Look then as one Brother being offended with another, and not able to heale him by the mouth of two or three Brethren privately, it behoveth him to carry it to the whole Church; so by proportion if one Church see matter of Offence in another, and be not able to heale it in a more private way, it will behoove them to procure the Assembly of many Churches, that the Offence may be orderly heard, and judged and removed. And more fully in another Treatise of his, The same constitution of a particular visible Church. p. 12.13. Where he cleerely distinguisheth this case, (in which he recommends a remedy by proportion from Mat. 18) from that case of Alls 15.

But say our Brethren, There is a remedy for Congregations, which is a going forth to other Churches, held out in ACts 15. A remedy of Coordination, such as between Nations, between Pares, not of Subordination. And were it so, how ineffectuall would it be for a Generall Councell or Nationall

Assembly, to excommunicate a Nation or Province?

Ans. 1. This doth not take away the strength of our Argument; it shewes not, that There is not the like reason of both, or if there be, that the same Course (so far as can be) is not proportionably to be used in both.

2. As to that point of Ineffectualnesse; we doubt not but our Brethren thinke that there is an Essicacy in Subordinations of Churches as well as persons, though there should be no proceeding to Excommunication of a Province or Nation; And though they would seeme to plead, that such a Subordination would be Inessectuall and to no purpose: We believe, their search is, it would be too Essectuals.

3. The Parity of Church and Church doth no more hinder the Sabordination of One Church to a Combination of Many, then the Parity of Brother and Brother will hinder the Subordination of one to a Congregation of many. And so it was with the Parity of Tribe and Tribe.

4. The Remedy themselves propose, as held forth Acts. 15. must have the same foundation with this Argument of ours; For 1, they do not

Aaa 2 fay

### 180 The Answer of the Assembly of Divines, unto the Reasons of

fay, That there was at Jerusalem an Elective Synod, but a Reference which (BY A LIKE REASON) will GIVE WARRANT to an Elective Synod.; For if one Church may go forth for help, then by the same reason many may so do; & if they may go forth to to or e Church for help. they may by the same reason goe forth to many, and thus by Equality of reason they gather warrant for an Elective Synod. 2. Nay more, our Brethren fay here, That all Churches (not only those to whom a reference is made) have a power to declare the Offence, and withdraw Communion from those Churches: Which power they have not by vertue of that Reference (for possibly there was none such made, at least not to all Churches) but in themselves, without such reference; and whence can our Brethren prove this, but by a Like Reason, either from Acts 15. or Mat. 18. for it is not Expresse in either. 3. Againe, the Declaration Alls 15. was not against the Church of Antioch, but against some persons in it that were guilty of those crimes: yet hence our Brethren infer a Declaration against an Offending Church: which must be on this ground, That this Meeting at Ferusalem might by the same reason declare against the Church of Antioch, if the Church offended, as they did against some persons in it, upon their offence.

5. Whereas our Brethren thinke there is no use of Subordination in Churches, unless for the Excommunicating of whole Churches (a thing not known in the Presbyterian government) their owne Instance alledged from Asts 15. shewes the contrary. For though the Decrees were directed and injoyned to Churches, yet not the Churches, but particular perfons in the Churches, are consured as subverters of the Faith, &c. And thus may a Classis or Synod, Excommunicate one or more persons in a Church, a Province, a Nation, without excommunicating of whole Churches; where as in sour Brethrens way, their Elestive Synods, do Non-Communicate Whole Societies for the offence of one or a few persons not redressed.

6. How ineffectuall would that be, if, according to this notion of Elective Synods, as our Brethren would have it, there were no other course to reclaime or deale with an Erroneous offending Church, but onely upon their own reference to such persons or Churches as themselves would choose, and onely so far as themselves please? If there had been no course taken with those subverters at Antioch, till themselves had made a reference to ferusalem; those Churches might much sooner have been insected with their leaven, then they perswaded to make such a reference. Our Brethren sometimes speake of Churches offended, requiring an account of Churches offending; but we find them here very sparing of insisting thereupon, or shewing upon what ground they build that practice. For the place of Atts 15. as they interpret it, of a voluntary Reference

64

by way of Arbitration to other Churches, is somewhat different from that of those other Churches calling them to an account without such a reference; nor will this be such an Elective Synod. And that Argument which would serve most fairely for warrant of that practise, (viz. by analogy from Mat. 18. pressed by Mr. Cotton and others) they cannot make use of, without granting our Argument. For if the Argument, from Analogy, be good but so far as they please to arge it; it sufficeth to our purpose in this proposition, which afferts onely a Subordinate, this proposition asserts not: yea, though the proposition had afferted that which our Brethren here suppose, the power of Excommunication in superior Assemblies, the Argument from Analogy would as well hold in that branch

of proceeding as in all the rest.

7. And our Brethrens exception, of the Ineffectualnesse which they urge: [ If they cannot use this remedy (of excommunicating a whole Nation) to what end is this subordination of Synods pleaded for? Is of no weight: For 1. there may be occasion of Subordination, yea of exercising the power of Excommunication in Synods, & that to good purpose, against particular Persons in a Province, or Nation, or particular Congregation, without excommunicating that whole Province, Nation, or Congregation; as the Meeting at fernsalem censured the false Teachers at Antioch without censuring. the Church of Antioch. 2. Or, if only the Ineffectualnesse, night be a reason why a Synod should not proceed to Excommunicate a Province or Congregation; yet this doth not prove, they have no authority to do it, but only, that there may be some cause to stop the Exercise of that power or Authority. As when a Prince or State makes a Law against Rebels or Traytors to punish them with Death; In case an Army of such Rebels or Traytors, or a whole Province rebels; this Multitude doth not excuse any one person of them from being obnoxious to that Law or the Penalty of it, vet it may be a reason why such a Prince or State should not (in prudence) execute that Rigor of the Law upon every person of them, but only upon some principall Offenders; yet is that whole Province, or Army of Rebels, subordinate to that Prince or State, and the Laws thereof.

Our Brethren likewise may remember, that many other things in the Assembly were given in Answer; as That this gives to a Synod of many Churches no more power over a Particular Church (yea a particular person) then one Brother hath over another Brother, yea over a whole Church; (For our Brethren will not deny, but that he may admonish, declare, and withdraw Communion:) That Independent Churches esteeme Non-Communion with other Churches their owne Happinesse; and therefore to be Non-Communicated would be to them No Punishment at all; or at least,

no other then what Themselves institt on All the Churches of the World besides: And That it is not sutable to the Wisdome of Jesus Christ to apply the Strongest Remedy, for the Weakest and least dangerous Disease, viz. the case of an offending Brother; and the Weakest Remedy to the most dangerous Disease, viz. the case of an offending Church.

Of this last onely, our Brethren take notice; and give no other Answer to it, but onely by way of Retortion: That in a Nationall Assembly, not onely there wants this Strongest Remedy, but they have the greatest Power to doe Hurt; and if they Erre, their Errour is greater then of a Bishop or Pope, who being but one, may be deposed; and the greater part of the Clergie being still the worse and more corrupt, and yet by the Presbyterian Principles must all be taken in, a Nationall Assembly chosen by them, are like to be, for the greatest part of them, the more Corrupt.

To which retortion, (omitting their so frequent using of the word Clergy, which, for what reasons they doe it, themselves best know: and their so frequent comparing the Government of the Reformed Churches to, and making it worse then, that of Popes and Bishops) we

Answer.

1. If a Nationall Assembly doe altogether want this remedy of Subordination, then should not our Brethren have charged us in their second Argument, with bringing in a forraign Ecclesiasticall Pomer over each State and Kingdome: and we know no reason for their so doing, unlesse thereby (as much as they can) to render this Government odious.

2. We say more of the Subordination of Generall Assemblies, then they of Particular Congregations; we say, not onely that they may Erre, be Subject to the advise of a Synod, be Separated from, Non-communicated, &c. we say, they are not more Independent then we think leffer Affemblies to be; For, if Providence leave a particular Church, without the help of neighbour Churches, they must needs want the benefit of Associations and Subordinations, (and fo must a particular Person, if he cannot enjoy the opportunity of joyning with any particular Congregation) but this is not their priviledge, but their loffe: the like we fay, when a Nationall Assembly cannot enjoy, absque gravissimis incommodis, the help of an Universall Synod, or an Synod of severall Nations.

3. All the Remedies that our Brethren hold out for particular Churches offending, leave then yet more Independent then Bishops or Popes; for these may be not onely admonished, prayed for, separated from, Noncommunicated, but (as our Brethren acknowledge) deposed; but their particular Congregations offending, are not subject to any such authoritative Censure, nor any persons in them, from any but their own Congrega-

tion.

183

tion. When Bellarmine and others, in the case of an Hereticall Pope, Bellar. de say, that though a Councell may not Depose him, yet they may Pray for him, Concil. I. and Admonish him; and that (saith Bellarmine) is sufficient; and though Christ have given no other humane efficacious Remedies for the evill that may arise by such a Pope, we must rest content, the Churches condition is safe, because it depends upon God, and not upon men: To this Doctor Ames Bel. Enerv. replies (and may it not be applyed to our Brethren?) Ecclesia igitur Tom. 2. 1. non est respublica persecta sibi sufficiens in ordine ad suum sinem; nor hath 1. Cop. 7. Christ provided means for all the Churches necessities.

Whitak. de

4. For healing the Offence or Errour of a Nationall Church, the Conc.qu. strongest and most efficacious Remedy that can be had, may be made use of; if that of a further Subordination cannot be had, the reason then, that it wants this Remedy, is not Because, though it could be had, it might not be used; but, Because, though it might be used, yet it cannot be had: But this will not be a reason why a particular Congregation should not make use of such remedies as may be had: No more then, Because if a Parliament Erre, there is no higher Court to Appeal to; therefore

there may not by an Appeale from inferiour Courts to it.

5. To what they adde, that the greater part of the Clergie are the more Corrupt, and yet must all be taken in; We say, I. Though such corrupt Ministers, as our Brethren suppose, and those Congregations that have such Ministers, and (as our Brethren suppose) can have no better, because there are no others to be had in their roome, have as much need as others to be under a Government, and not therefore to doe what they lift without controle, because they are Corrupt; (for we doe not think our Brethren will own this Principle, That because the greater part of Men are the more Corrupt, therefore there may be no Government, but every one be allowed to doe what is good in his own eyes;) yet that such corrupt Minifters must needs be taken into Synods, we see no reason, nor doth our Proposition assert. it 2. And as to their Electing of a National Assembly; though we doubt not but such corrupt Ministers as our Brethren suppose, who deserve to be deposed from being Ministers, may well be denyed their Vote in Election; yet, if their supposition were granted, they have no better reason to conclude, That the greater part of a Nationall Assembly must be corrupt, because chosen by the generality of Ministers; then, That the greater part of a Parliament must needs be corrupt, because chosen by the generality of Men, of whom the greater part may as well be supposed to be the worse, as the greater part of Ministers. And indeed this Argument doth not so much oppose Subordination of Synods, as it strikes at the root of All Government, both Ecclefiasticall and Civill.

But say our Brethren, the preserving the rights and liberties of a State, and seeking the common good of it, is naturall to the generality of men; but the Truthes of the Gospell, and the Purity of Religion, and the Power thereof, is contrary to the Principles of all naturall men, and hath ever been opposed by the most part of the Clergie.

Ans. 1. This at most would prove only, That corrupt men may more safely be trusted with civil Liberties; it doth not prove, but That according to their Argument, the Parliament are like to be the more corrupt,

as well as the Generall Assembly.

And 2. Though they might thereupon be trusted with civil Liberties, yet (according to these principles) they must not meddle with Religion

at all, more then the Nationall Synud.

3. Though the generality of corrupt men may be forward enough to preserve the Liberties of a State; (yea, and liberty of Conscience too) yet they are not forward to have sinne punished; yet That is one maine

Work of bodies Politick.

4. If the Truth of the Gospell, and the purity and power of Religion, be contrary to the principles of all natural men, yea, and much more, then the Rights and Liberties of a State: then is there lesse reason that every Person, or Combination of persons should be permitted under pretence of Conscience, to Beleeve and Practice what they please, in matters of Religion; then, that they should so be permitted in matters of State; For if the generality of men be in matters of Religion the more corrupt (and the more apt to corrupt others) they have the more need of

Government.

5. But why our Brethren should thus seek occasion to cast odious asperfions upon the ministery in generall, as here they do, (That in greater badyes of the Clergy, the greater part are, and have been still the Worse and more corrupt; That Ministers, if not converted, are of all others, the worst and greatest opposers to Religion; That in a Nationall Assembly, the greater number are like to be of the Worst; That in all Ages, the most of the Clergie have been aptest to corrupt the Truth, and to oppose the purity and power of Religion) we cannot tell, unlesse it be their designe to Blast and Vilisie, (as much as they can) not only the Authority and Power of Synods, but the Office and Work of the Ministery or Clergy, (as they love to call them;) especially when they know that Synods in Reformed Churches consist of Others beside Ministers; and that perhaps in as large or larger proportion.

6. But if it be true which they say, that the generality of Ministers are thus apt to corrupt the Truth & oppose Religion in the power and purity of it; then of how dangerous a confequence would that be, if every fuch Minister must

be permitted to seduce and gather to himself a company of people at his owne pleasure, who should thenceforth plead Exemption and Independency in reference to any Authoritative Ecclesiasticall Judicatory whatever? especially when we may far more truely say, of those that, to obtaine Liberty, would pretend Tendernesse of Conscience and Exemption from Ecclesiasticall Judicatures, what our Brethren here say of Ministers, viz. That of those the greater part are and have been still the worse and more

corrupt, as is apparent in this Kingdome at present.

7. This reason of our Brethren doth no way take off the strength of that Objection; For we say further, that both Parliaments, Synods, and particular Churches have many times dangerously erred; which proves, That great care should be had of those who are to be elected and admitted into such Assemblies, that no just exception may be made against them, but not, That such Assemblies should not therefore be. Nor doth this answer of our Brethren at all take off the strength of our Argument à pari ratione, that by their Argument, there must either be punishments for Parliaments, or none for inferiour Courts.

Our Brethren adde; that after the first 300 years when Synods began

to be most in credit, the mystery of Iniquity grew up with them.

Answ. 1. So have many Schismes and other errors, with Independent Congregations. 2. So do Tares and Wheat. 3. The truth is, the mysterie of Iniquity increased, as well constituted Synods did decrease; for as the Pope was exalted, so were Synods disgraced and dissified much

like as it was with us, between Prerogative and Parliaments.

And for what they fear, That by this meanes New truths would not be taught, but suppressed, till a whole Nation is inlightened in it; We answer, That Synods ought to surpresse new Errors, and old ones revived, though they come in the name of new Truthes; if they do otherwise, its the fault of the Men, not the Government, and we must not deny all power of suppressing Errors, for fear lest possibly some men may abuse that power to the prejudice of Truth; no more then we may take away all of punishing Malesators, for feare that some should abuse that power to the prejudice of the Innocent. It is certaine true, That the Highest Courts, if corrupted, may doe the most mischiese; but it follows not, That therefore such Courts (though uncorrupted) should not be.

Their fecond answer to our Argument à pari ratione from Mat. 18, is this, The efficacy of all remedies depends, 1. on Christs Blessing, which depends upon his Institution; but Par ratio will never set up an Ordinance of Christ. 2. The Sutablenesse of the condition of those that are to be dealt with; now its more Sutable for Churches to be dealt with in a Brotherly

Bbb

way of Admonition and Withdrawing Communion; as if a Province, or a Multitude rebell, a State will not hang up all, though to particular Persons this were an efficacious remedy. 3. Christ hath suted his remedies to all

times, and all conditions.

Ans. 1. If Par ratio will not set up an Ordinance of Christ, yet it may serve to prove an Ordinance of Christ, or at least to warrant a pra-Etise, which is enough to our purpose. If not, How will our Brethren prove Baptizing of Infants, or Womens receiving of the Lords Supper, to be Institutions of Christ? How will they prove from Mat. 18. an Institution of Christ to proceed in case of a publike scandall as well as of a private Offence; or to proceed against a Sifter offending in the same manner, as with and offending Brother? How will they prove, that it is an Ordinance of Christ that our Synods must be Now, Elective, as they suppose it was in the case of Antioch? or How will they prove that Synods are at all, an Ordinance of Christ, if (as they say) the meeting at ferusalem were not a formall Synod? How will they prove their Non-Communion of Churches, from the example of Pauls departing from Barnabas Act. 15. 39. which they alleadge for it, upon this ground, That look what power one Arustle had in reference to another Apostle, the same hath one Church to another Church? In all which (befide many more Instances that might be alledged) our Brethren will be very far to seeke, unlesse they will admit a par ratio to prove an Institution.

2. This way of proceeding with Churches is a very Sutable remedy; and our Brethrens Instance will help to make it out; For as if a Province rebell, the Ring-leaders of that Rebellion may be hang'd up, without hanging up all in that Province, and the rest reduced by other means (though yet the whole Province be subordinate to that Prince or State:) So may a Synod Provinciall or Nationall excommunicate the cheif Offenders in an Erring Church without excommunicating that whole Church, and reclaime the rest by other meanes, and yet that whole Church be Sub-cordinate to that Synod. But if they may onely Admonish an offending Church, and, if that prevaile not, withdraw communion from them; it is much as if that Prince or State, who may hang a single Rebell, but in case a Province or Multitude rebell, he may onely send them an Admonition to lay downe their Armes, and if that prevaile not, Declare them Re-

bels and then let them take their owne courfe.

3. To that of Christs suting his remedies to all times and conditions; We have answered before, (for indeed many of our Brethrens Arguments are more then once produced:) Synods and Associations are at all times a Remedy to be made use of, so far as may be obtained, and as may most tend to the effecting of those ends for which they are appointed

appointed: But, that Gods providence is so sutable to his Institutions, that what ever may, by his appointment, be made use of at any time, can be injoyed at all times, and in all.conditions, our Brethren will never prove. Ruling Elders, Deacons, Elderships are by our Br: acknowledged & professed to be Institutions of Christ, yet they will not say that all their Congregations (perhaps not any of them) have been so happy as at all times and in all Conditions to have them all. Imposition of hands on Church officers by an Eldership, our Brethren acknowledge to be an Institution of Christ, yet we believe that some of their Congregations have not at all times and in in all conditions been in a capacity of such imposition of hands, or have had an Eldership to do it. To say nothing of Excommunication and Church censures, which we thinke that all their Churches have not been at times and in all conditions in a capacity to exercise according to their owne principles.

Their last answer is this; If the Analogy of Mat. 18. be argued from, Then. 1. Let the Analogy be kept, For as a Brother is not at first to be brought to a standing Court, but admonished first by One, then by Two or Three: So by this proportion insteed of these Set and Standing Assemblies there should onely be two or three or more neighbour Churches to admonish the Offending Church, not a standing Court

Ans. I f not at first brought to a standing Court, yet there must be a standing Court by this proportion to which it may at length be

brought.

2. Though in private offences between man and man, there must be first private Admonition, to prevent (if it may be) the making of it publike; yet our Brethren (we thinke) will not say, that in an Open scandall, which is publike already, the Church may not take notice of it till some private Brethren have thus proceeded. We read of no such private Admonition injoyned by Paul in the case of the Incessum Corinthian; Nor I Tim. 5.12. in rebuking those that sinne openly. But cases brought to a Synod, are supposed to be known before; if not, we grant that the same obligation of private admonition lieth upon those who shall complaine to a Synod (either of a Church or of a Person) as on those that complaine to a particular Church.

To what they next adde their (Argument so often repeated) And 2. where is a Synod called The Church. We Answer, That when our Brethren have shewed us first, where the Elders and Brethren of a particular Congregation, without the women and Children are so called, and secondly that a Synod is not so called in Mat. 18. we shall then besides those Answers formerly given (which yet are abundantly sufficient) give them more.

Bbb 2

The

The Answer of the Affembly of Divines unto the Reasons of

188

The Church Universall (they grant) is called a Church and One body to Christ; but say they, as Materially considered and not as a Politick body in respect to government, which was never yet asserted by this Assembly.

Answ. Whether the Assembly have yet asserted this or no, is not materiall; there are many Truthes in Divinity, which this Assembly hath never YET asserted: But, That this Church Universall is an Organical Body, in which the members are not all one member but many, and those many members have severall distinct functions: That the Officers, Ordinances, esc. are set in this Church, and given to this Church Universall, and are to exercise their severall offices as in relation to the whole, and for the good of the whole; and, That every Particular Visible Church (which our Brethren will not deny to be a politicall body for government) is but a part or member of this Church generall, (and much more to this purpose; ) we thinke our Brethren will not say, That this Assembly hath never yet afferted: But whether they will thinke that this is tantamount as to say, the Church generall is a Politick Body, we do not much passe; for we list not to contend with our Brethren for words.

To what they last object, Then 3. by this Argument from Analogie, no more power must be placed in the greater Assembly then in the particular Congregation. We answer; What power the superior Assembly hath over the subordinate, is not the question in this Proposition. If there be a Subordination of the Assemblies one to the other, it is as much as this Proposition contends for. And let our Brethren grant the like power to Synods over offending Congregations, as we grant a Congregation to have

over an offending Brother, and the controversie will soone end.

Concordat cum Originali.

Adoniram Byfield, Scriba.

The

## REASONS

OF THE DISSENTING BRETHREN

CONCERNING

## THEPOWER

CONGREGATIONS,

Having in them a Sufficient Presbytery
FOR

ORDINATION.



Printed for Humphrey Harward. 1648.

I.



# Against the PROPOSITION touching Ordination: viz.

It is very requisite, That no single Congregation that can conveniently associate, doe assume to it selfe all and sole power in Ordination:

We offer these Reasons.

Here there is a sufficient Presbytery, all and sole power in Ordination may be assumed, though Association may be had:
But there may be a sufficient Presbytery in a particular Congregation.

The Major hath two parts: 1. That a sufficient Presbyterie may assume all and sole power in Ordination. 2. That it may doe so,

though it may associate.

The former part is proved, I Tim.4.14. By the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, as is voted by the Assembly, which is the only Scripture brought for Ordination by ordinary Elders.

The second part, [That they may doe this though they may associate] appeares,

1. Because Association doth neither adde to, nor diminish the power of a Presbytery: it is by way of Accumulation, not Privation, as is

acknowledged by the Reformed Churches.

2. If Association be so necessarily required, where it may be had; then neither a Classicall, Provinciall, nor Nationall Presbytery can assume all and sole power in Ordination, if there be any other Classicall, Provinciall, or Nationall Presbytery, with whom they may associate: And that there is, or may be alwayes some, is necessarily to be supposed in these times of the Gospell, if any Association ought to be.

The Minor, that there may be a sufficient Presbytery in a particular

Congregation, is proved,

1. By the second proposition touching Church Government, sent up to the Honourable Houses of Parliament, viz. A Presbytery consists of (Ministers of the Word, and such other publike Officers, as are agreeable to, and warranted by the Word of God to be Church-Governours to joyne with the Ministers in the Government of the Church.

All which may be in a particular Congregation.

2. Wherein consists the sufficiency of a Presbytery? The number of how many Elders, is not set or bounded by Institution; suppose two or three: & if more be requisite, in a particular Congregation there may be four or five: And a Presbytery over many Congregations, is acknowledged to be sufficient, though it consist of no more: If they have this power as a sufficient Presbytery, why not the other also? Have they their power only, as having relation to many Congregations? Is that, the essential requisite to their sufficiency? Here are Elders, and as many Elders, having relation to a Church: and the Argument used by the Reverend Assembly to prove a Presbytery over many Congregations, is, that Elders are mentioned in Relation to One Church.

That which two Apostles being joyned together, might doe in a particular Congregation, that ordinary Elders may doe in a particular Congregation: But Paul and Barnabas ordained Elders in particular Congregations, though they might associate.

Therefore, coc.

The Consequence appears thus, If the Argument brought by the Reverend Assembly doe hold, viz. That when the Apostles meet together for ordination, or for ordering the affaires of the Church of Jerusalem, they meet as ordinary Elders, (which they have voted) then surely, when Paul and Barnabas met to ordaine Elders in particular Congregations; it is to be averred they met for that act as ordinary Elders.

The Minor hath two parts. 1. Paul and Burnabas ordained Elders in

particular Congregations. 2. That they might Affociate.

1. That these were particular Congregations wherein they ordained

Elders, appeares,

Because it is not supposable, that the Cities, much lesse the Regions round abound, where the Apostles preached & erected Churches, (as appears by Ast. 13.49. compared with Ast. 14.6. 21,22,23.) were grown to many Congregations before the Apostles appointed Elders to them: For the Apostles who were to preach in all places,

II.

places, would not stay so long in one place; and it was their Course, when they were there, ingroi, as at Derhe, Act. 14.21. to set Elders to them.

Againe, this was the first ordination of Elders to those places, and therefore must need be to particular Congregations, for the

Classis is made up of the Elders of many Congregations.

Lastly, they ordained Elders, rett enanted and autois; and at their ordaining, they fasted and prayed, commending them to the Grace of God; which fasting and praying, being (according to the principles of us both) to be in particular Congregations, it followeth that the Churches, to which those Elders were appointed, were particular Congregations.

For the second, that they might Associate, it appears,

Because there were Churches in the Regions Round about, and yet the Apostle mentions not Association, which they would have done, if that had been the way, for when they did things with ordinary Elders, it is thus Recorded, The Apostles and Elders:

But they Commend them to the Grace of God, as Paul did the Church of Ephesus, Ast. 20. 32. as leaving sufficient meanes to perpetuate succession, and to ordaine other Elders, if any should die, as also to build them up to eternall life.

Sic subscribitur:

Tho. Goodwin,
Philip Nye,
Jer. Burroughes,
Sidrach Sympson.

William Bridge, William Greenhill, William Carter.

Concordat cum Originali.

Adeniram Byfield, Scriba.

M. B. This title-page is misplaced, and ought to be to front of that part of this collection which begins at page 183

THE ends at page 211.

# ANSWER

OFTHE

ASSEMBLY of DIVINES

TO THE

# REASONS

OFTHE

DISSENTING BRETHREN

Against the Proposition concerning

ORDINATION.



LONDON,
Printed for Humphrey Harward. 1648.

### Die fovis 20. April. 1648.

Hereas there is an Order of the right Honourable the House of Peers for the printing of all their Reasons of the Dissenting Brethen, against severall Propositions concerning Presbyteriall Government, and the Answers of the Assembly to those Reasons; It is Ordered that the like Order be granted for the printing and publishing of the Answer of the Assembly, to the Reasons against the Proposition concerning Ordination, the Reasons being already printed, and the answer of the Assembly to those Reasons, though brought into the Assembly long before their Lordships Order, yet not passing in the Assembly till since the said Order, and so is not included in it.

Jo. Browne Cler. Parl.



The state of the s

# The Answer to the Reasons of the Dissenting Brethren Against the Proposition touching Ordination, viz.

It is very requisite that no single Congregation, that can conveniently associate, do assume to its self all and sole power in Ordination.



Mong all the Propositions which the Assembly presented to the Honourable Houses of Parliament, concerning Ordination, our Brethren have singled out this one, to which they enter their Dissent; as if this alone were opposite to their opinions touching this matter: Which, whether it be so, or, that there was not some

other reason of their insisting on this, rather then on any of the rest, themselves best know. We remember that in a Proposition not altogother unlike to this, some others of the Assembly differed somewhat in the debate from the Major part. And we have observed our Brethren ready enough to take notice and make use of any such difference (although sometimes but in point of method; as, whether, of two propositions, This, or That should be first debated and to talke of a third party in the Assembly. We observe likewise that the Arguments here brought against this Proposition are not properly Arguments of their owne, nor pressed by themselves in the Assembly, nor such as are most sutable to their owne opinions; but, Arguments used by others, in that debate. And whether that difference were not some reason, why our Brethren chose rather to insist upon this Proposition in their Dissent, then on fome other, themselves are best able to determine. We expected from our Brethren (in a search for Truth, not a contest for Victory) Arguments to prove, That every single Congregation (whether there be in it a sufficient, or insufficient Presbytery, or none at all) have the whole power of Ordination within themselves; and that, none but themselves may Ordaine for them: (For, we suppose our Brethren, or at least some of Ccc 2 them. them, are of this opinion:) but this, they are pleafed to decline. We must observe also of these borrowed Arguments brought by our Brethren against this Proposition, that neither of them concludes against the Proposition in debate. The first can conclude onely this, That there MAY BE such a Presbytery, as may assume all and sole power; not that there is; nor (if they were) That, it is requisite they should so do. The other concludes onely thus much, That ORDINARY ELDERS may Ordaine IN a particular Congregation, (which we never denyed:) not, That the Elders of one single Congregation may Ordaine; nor, That they may assume all and sole power in Ordination; nor, That it is requisite they should so do. But, such as they are, we shall take them into Consideration in order.

#### The Answer to their first Argument.

Their first Argument is thus framed. "Where there is a sufficient Presibytery, all and sole power in Ordination may be assumed, though Association may be had. But there may be a sufficient Presbytery in a particular "Congregation. What their conclusion would be we cannot tell, but we thinke they would conclude, Therefore a particular Congregation may assume all and sole Power in Ordination though association may be had: But, they must adde also, and it is Requisite that they do assume it, though association may be had, Conveniently: or else, they conclude not against the Proposition. And were their Argument so framed, we must tell them, that, besides lesser faults, there would be these two great ones in it. 1. That there is more in the Conclusion then is in the Premisses. And 2. That it apparently consistent of four termes: For in the Major Proposition it is, where there Is a sufficient Presbytery; the Minor sayeth onely, there May Be; which is a very materiall difference.

#### To their Major.

"The Major (say they) hath two parts. 1. That a sufficient Presbytery may assume all and sole power in Ordination. 2. That it may doe so,

"though it may affociate.

Answ. 1. But we thinke, when they better consider of it, themselves will say, That neither of these parts are true. Not the first part; For They do not place the whole power in the Presbytery, but share it between them and the people; and, therein, sometimes they tell us, they go in a middle way between the Brownists and the Presbyterians. And is not the first part, much lesse the second.

Besides

Besides that, in thus arguing, they confirme a power of Ordination in a Classicall Presbytery, which they would oppose; For, they cannot deny, but that in a Classic there may be a sufficient Presbytery; Or, if they deny it, the Proof that they here bring, to prove the sufficiency of a Presbytery in a Congregation, will much more strongly prove the sufficiency.

ency of a Presbytery in a Classis.

Nor can they help themselves, in saying, That, by a sufficient Presbytery, they mean a Congregation that bath a sufficient Presbytery (thereby, either to take in the People, or shut out the Classis:) For, (besides that this would not serve their turne to make a Major Proposition to their Argument, and, that such kind of expositions would seeme too harsh to be justified;) the Proof they annex would not serve to confirme it; For, they could not say, That it is proved by I Tim. 4. 14. (which speaks nothing either of the people, or of a Congregation, but only of a Presbytery;) nor That it was so voted by the Assembly.

2. And as this is inconsistent with their owne principles, so neither can We allow it, to be in it self, a truth, That, wherever there is a sufficient Presbytery (especially in our Brethrens sense, who tell us elsewhere, That two Elders, though neither of the Word, are a sufficient Eldership) they may assume all and sole power in Ordination, when yet they have opportunity and convenience to associate with o-

thers: much lesse, That, it is Requisite for them so to do. For

1. We thinke it very possible, that there may be so many Elders, as might be sufficient, for number, in some sense, to be called an Elder sip, and might perhaps be safely entrusted (under the inspection of others) with managing some affaires which concern one single Congregation onely (at least enow to make such an Eldership, as our Brethren deeme sufficient) whom, yet, to invest with such a power as our Brethren here claime for them, would be very unfafe: nor do we beleeve that Christ hath so invested them. For, we do not thinke it to be the will of Christ, that every such number of Elders as our Brethren account a sufficient Eldership (consisting perhaps but of two ruling Elders) should be entrusted with such a power, as to be sole judges of the fitnesse of a person for the Minifery, and, actually to ordaine him thereunto, so as, he mult thenceforth be owned as a minister of Christ, by all other Churches, as well as that to whom these Elders belong (for we cannot thinke, as perhaps our Brethren doe, that a Minister is a minister ONLY to his owne Congregation, and may there only performe ministerial acts:) Much lesse That they are to be trusted with all and sole power therein; and, That they might do it, not only inconsultis, but even renitentibus omnibus vicinis Ecclesiis:

Ccc 3

And,

And, least of all, That they may assume such power (whether others allow it them or no) so soon as they deeme themselves such a sufficient Eldership (for who but themselves shall be Judges of it?) and, That it is requisite that they so doe, yea though they might associate, and that

conveniently.

2. Nor are we such friends to Classicall Presbyteries because Classicall, as, to affirme it Requisite for every Classicall Presbytery, to assume all, and sole power in Ordination. For we hold it very possible that in a Classic, where there may be Elders sufficient for number, to be called an Eldership (for we list not to dispute the minimum quod sic) their Number may be yet so small, or their Abilities so weake, or their sudgements (at least many of them) so erroneous, or their Lives so corrupt, that we should not hold it requisite to intrust them with a power of Ordination, when they may with

convenience affociate with others better qualified.

And, if our Brethren say, This is but a particular case and extraordinary: and, That we will not judge it much confiderable in making the ordinary rule, which cannot be supposed to provide particularly for all cases possibly incident: We say the like for their sufficient Presbytery in a particular Congregation. For, we thinke it will be a case as extraordinary, to find, in a particular Congregation, a Presbytery Sufficient to be intrusted with all and sole power of Ordination. We believe that such a Presbytery as that in Charenton near Paris; or, such as was, in the debate of this point, supposed possible, (viz. a particular Congregation having fix or eight preaching Presbyters constantly imployed in the Ministery,) are not like to be the Precedents of ordinary Congregations, or Congregationall Presbyteries in this Kingdome. And, if ever such a thing should happen, it will be then time enough to consider of that extraordinary case, Whether it be more requisite for that Eldership, To assume the whole & fole power of Ordination; or, To affociate with the Elders of other neighbour Congregations, if (as the Proposition supposeth) they may with convenience fo doe, rather then make such a precedent (though themselves should be thought able for such a worke) for other Congregations or Presbyteries lese sufficient to claime the like, to the prejudice of themselves, as well as of the neighbour Churches?

3. Neither can we allow, that even those Classicall Presbyteries who may be conceived most sufficient to be entrusted with a power of Ordination, may therefore assume all and sole power in it, without Appeales, or Subordination to superiour Assemblies; at least, when such Superiour Assemblies may conveniently be injoyed. Yet, such is that whole and sole power which our Brethren challenge for particular Congregations: and that, not onely for some particular Congregations, but for all; not

only

only where there is a sufficient Presbytery (as here they speak) that is, any two Elders; but also where there is not: for even a Congregation without Elders, are by them supposed to have the whole, and sole power of Ordination within themselves; so as, they neither stand in need of any Power without themselves for the doing of it, nor may there be any Appeal from them in it, nor may any but themselves Ordaine for them. And if any thing less then this be allowed them, they would not think it to be All and Sole power. If, in Government, there be somewhat which themselves alone may not performe, or that there be Appeals from them to Superiour Assemblies, or that any others but themselves might (in reference to them) exercise it, they would not think that they had all and sole power in Government: So for Ordination, if either themselves alone may not Ordaine; or, any others Ordaine for them; or that, in matter of Ordination, there may be Appeals from them; they would not think that they have all and sole power in Ordination allowed to them.

"The former part (that a sufficient Presbytery may assume all and Sole "power in Ordination) is proved (say they) 1 Tim. 4.14. by the laying on

" of the hands of the Presbytery, as is Voted by the Assembly.

Presbytery, or every number of Presbyters, who are sufficient to be called a Presbytery; (for, if their Major Proposition be not Universall, their Argument will conclude nothing:) And, if so, We deny, that the Assembly bath ever voted, I Tim. 4. 14. to prove, that every such Presbytery, (at least according to our Brethrens judgement, concerning a sufficient Presbytery) may assume all, and Sole power in Ordination. Nor is this at all made out by what they adde; ["Which is the onely Scripture bought for Ordination by ordinary Elders;] For, if it were so, yet, it is one thing to vote, That Ordination may be performed by ordinary Elders; another thing to vote, That every company of such Elders hath all and Sole power in Ordination. Nor doe we think our Brethren will allow this to follow from that other.

And we have the lesse reason to believe, that the place alledged will prove, That every particular Eldership may assume all, and sole power of Ordination (even when they might conveniently associate,) so as they Alone. & Onely they may there Ordaine: Not onely 1. because of Pauls joyning in that Ordination (as our Brethren elsewhere affert from 2 Tim. 1. 6.) who was not a fixed member of any Particular Eldership: But likewise 2. because even that Presbytery there spoken of, by whom Timothy was ordained, seemes not to be the Presbytery of any Particular Congregation, having power to Ordaine Officers for themselves one-

Apollon.
Confideratio quarundam controversiarium,
c. 6. q. 2.

ly; but, a Presbytery made up of Elders from severall places; as Derbe, Lystra, and Iconium, and the region round about, as is probable from Att. 16. 1, 2. compared with Att. 14. 6. as is observed by Apollonius, (out of the Belgick interpreters) in a treatise of his directed to this Assembly, from the Wallachrian Churches, Cap. 6. Quest. 2. So that, how this place can prove, That, in every Sufficient Presbytery, there is Alland Sole power of Ordination; so as themselves alone may ordaine, and none but themselves have power to joyne in it; and, That it is Requisite they doe assume this power to themselves we doe not discerne. Especially when as 3. the Apostle Paul (whose authority certainly was as great as the authority of a particular Eldership) thought it requisite that others as well as himself should joyn in Timothies Ordination, and thought it no disparagement to Associate with them.

"The second part (that they may doe this, though they might Associate)
"appears (say they) 1. Because association doth neither adde to, nor diminish
"the power of a Presbytery; it is by way of Accumulation, not Privation as

" is acknowledged by the Reformed Churches.

Ans. Our Brethren taking it now for granted, That the Presbytery mentioned 1 Tim. 4. 14. (where Timothy, an Evangelift, and so not an Officer of one fingle Congregation, was ordained) was a particular Presbyterie, and not Classicall, or made up of Elders of severall Congregations; and That, beside this particular Presbyterie, there was none else that either did, or had power to joyne with them; and, That they did affume all and sole power in Ordination, (which perhaps at another time they would not grant, because of the peoples interest;) and, That it was Requisite for them so to doe; and consequently, That every sufficient Presbyterie (that is, every Presbytery; for our Brethren will not say, that any Presbytery is insufficient, although consisting but of two ruling Elders) may assume, yea, and that it is requisite that they doe assume, all and sole power, and not affociate with others: That which they now attempt to prove, is, That an Opportunity to Associate, even with Covenience, doth not hinder but that they may thus assume; Yea, and that it is requisite so to doe. For, we are not now disputing, what may be done in some possible cases; as, if a single Congregation were cast upon some remote Island, or in the midst of Heathens, Turkes, Pagans, or even amongst Papists, or the like, where either there be none to Associate with, or onely such as would make such Association Destructive to them, (for, what power they may assume or exercise in such a case, is not the Question now in hand:) But Whether even there, where they may conveniently Associate, it be yet Lawfull and Requisite that every PrelbyPresbytery (at least every sufficient Presbytery) do assume all and sole pomer of Ordination?

To the reason they alleadge (because Association doth neither adde to nor

diminish the power of a Presbytery) we answer.

1. We are glad to hear our Brethren acknowledge that Association doth not Diminish the power of a Presbytery: for, if so, then why do they deny that power to diverse Presbyteries associated into one Classis, which they allow to each of them singly? And why be our Brethren so affraid of it, and represent it, upon all occasions, so prejudiciall to Congregations, and to their power? If the power of a Presbytery be not diminished by associating with others; and this, acknowledged by the reformed Churches, (as our Brethren here intimate) we know little reason why they should be so averse from it.

But 2. that, by Association, there is nothing added to the power of a Presbytery, we cannot grant them: for, we believe, that Presbyteries in Association, have more power (at least Extensively, if not Intensively) then a single Presbytery alone. And, though it were granted, That Presbyteries Associated, could do no other asts, then each Presbytery single; yet, their power might extend further then the power of a single

Presbytery.

3. If what they alleadge were true, That, by affociation there were neither Addition, nor Diminution of Power; yet doth not this prove ought, but that it may be requisite for them to Associate: Because though there were no addition of Power, or Authority, yet there would be thereby an addition of Sufficiency, or Ability; and, in reference thereunto, it might be requisite, at least for some, to associate: Yea, even those who may be thought most able, if not for any need of their owne (as conceiving themselves so sufficient, that they want no help) yet at least for the good of others, who may stand in need of help from them. Though they had fingly a like authority to do the thing, yet in Association they will have a greater ability to doe it well. And therefore, if, by Association, there be no Diminution of Tower (as our Brethren here affirme) and withall an Addition of Ability, it is requisite, that where it may be had conveniently, it be made use of; and, consequently, it is not requisite that every fingle Presbytery, though some way sufficient, should decline Association, and assume to themselves all and sole power.

And that the Inconsequence of this Reason may the more appeare, we shall propose a case that is like enough to fall out often in our Brethrens way. If in a Single Congregation of their way, there were no other Ruling Officers, but one Pastor and one Ruling Elder, we believe

Ddd

they would say, that these are a sufficient Presbytery; and that, if no more can be had, they may exercise the whole power of an Eldership to that Congregation; yet, if God afford opportunity to them of having another Minister, to be a Teacher, or one or more persons fit to be ruling Elders, we believe they would thinke it requifite to have a larger Presbytery then that of two: But we aske, WHY? fince when two more be added to the former two, it will neither adde to, nor diminish the power of the Presbytery: For, those two (they suppose) had the entire power of a Presbytery, and the whole four can have no more, so that there is no addition of power; and why there should thereby be a diminution of power we cannot see. We suppose they would answer, Because, though there be no addition of Power, yet there is an addition of Ability, and these four are now more able to manage those affaires, then those two alone. And the like we say in the case of Association: For, though (as our Brethren affirme) it did neither adde to, nor diminish the power, yet diverse Presbyteries affociated are more able to manage that power, then each of them fingle: (To fay nothing of a multitude of other inconveniencies that are thereby likewise avoided.)

What our Brethren adde, That it is by way of Accumulation, not Privation, as is acknowledged by the Reformed Churches; We acknowledge likewise; being glad our Brethren do acknowledge it too. And, we hope, that what they here make the foundation of their owne Argument, they will not afterwards deny, when we shall have occasion to make use of it.

But, if they infer, That therefore, whatever a fingle Church might do alone, when they did not, or could not affociate with others, they alone may do now, when they may, or do affociate; we deny that Consequence. And we give reason for that deniall, from a practise that they must needs grant in their owne way. For, in a fingle Congregation where the Eldership consists but of three Elders (which according to our Brethrens principles is a very fufficient Presbytery) any Two of these may performe any Presbyteriall act, because they are the major part of the whole Eldership; But, in case this Eldership be encreased to the number of five (as well it may,) the act of those two shall not be now accounted the act of the Eldership (as before it was.) and that, Because there be sow others adjoyned to them, who before were not. Yet, we suppose, our Brethren cannot deny, but that this Addition of more members to the Eldership, is by way of Accumulation, not of Privation; for the power is not taken from any of the former members by adding of these new ones. but others are admitted to the same power: And that difference which doth arise upon it, (That those two, could before performe a Presbyteriall act, but but now cannot,) is meerely Accidentall; Because, before, they were the major part of the Eldership, but, now, they are not. For they had not that power, quaterus Two, but, quaterus the Major part. And so it is in Association of divers Elderships in one Classis, for the performing of such acts as they are all concerned in: and yet, this difference is by way of Accumulation properly, and not of Privation: for there is an Accumulation of the power of more Elders in the same judgement: and, if the Votes of a few, who were before able to have carried the businesse, be not sufficient now to do it, it is not because their Votes are less valid in themselves, then they were before, but onely ex accidenti, because they are not (now) the Major part.

They adde. 2. If association be so necessarily required, where it may be had, then neither a Classicall, Provinciall, nor Nationall Presbytery can assume all and sole power of Ordination, if there may be any other Classicall, Provinciall, or Nationall Presbytery, with whom they may associate. And that there is, or may be always some, is necessarily to be supposed in these times of the Gospell, if any Association ought to be.

Answ. This doth no way hurt us at all: For,

1. We do not say, that either Classicall, or Provincial Assemblies may assume all and sole power; but, that there may be Appeales from either, where there are higher Assemblies to appeale to: No, nor yet the National Assembly, if there may be (with convenience) an Association larger then it: As we show at large in our answer to our Brethreas reasons against Subordination. A Provincial or National Assembly may ordaine Ministers, as well as a Classis; yea, and may depose those whom a Classis ordaineth: And we would say the like of a superior Assembly to a National, if there were a like opportunity of larger association.

Yet, 2. there is lessed danger in trusting a Classis, or Synod, with a power of Ordination, then in trusting a particular Congregation with it, (as might easily be shewed, if it were needfull to mention the insufferable mischieses that would arise, if every Eldership in a Congregation might ordaine for Ministers whom they please, without controll) and therefore more requisite, that Congregations do not assume that power. So that neither the thing supposed to Follow upon our Proposition is any Absurdi-

ty, nor is the Consequence valid.

Especially, if 3. we consider that the Proposition doth not say, (as they here suppose) that Association is necessarily required where it may be had, (which yet perhaps might have been said more safely, then what our Brethren assert) but that it is very requisite, where it may be had with convenience,

To their Minor.

The Minot (that there may be a sufficient Presbytery in a particular Congregation) is proved (say they) 1. by the second Proposition touching Church Government sent up to both Houses of Parliament viz. [A Presbysery consists of Ministers of the Word, and such other publike officers as are agreeable to, & warranted by the word of God to be Church governors, to joyne with the ministers in the government of the Church.] All which may be in a particular Congregation.

Ans. How this of the Assembly should prove our Brethrens Proposition, we cannot understand. That a Presbytery consists of Ministers & Ruling Elders, we think e our Brethren will not deny; But, will our Brethren hence infer, that, where ever there be Ministers and ruling Elders, there is a sufficient Presbytery to performe All acts that belong to any Presbyteries?

If so; then they must not deny, Classicall, Provinciall and Nationals Assemblies to be sufficient Presbyteries (at least, if they be made up of Ministers and ruling Elders; ) and that, they may Ordaine, Excommunicate, Censure, and do all Presbyteriall acts lawfull for a Presbytery to doe. If not; then, how doth This Proposition prove their Minor? We do not yet see the strength of this Consequence, That, If a Presbytery confift of Ministers and Ruling Elders, Then there may be a sissificient Presbytery in a particular Congregation unto all acts; and, particularly, unto Ordination. We fay, That Classes and Synods, Provinciall, and Nationall, confift of Ministers and Ruling Elders; but, we doe not say, (nor can our Brethren infer it from our words) That, therefore, there may be, in a single Congregation, a sufficient Classicall Presbytery, or a sufficient Provinciall, or Nationall Synod; Either of which might yet with as good consequence, be affirmed, as that which our Brethren impose. That the Assemblies Proposition was true, we suppose our Brethren will not deny; (if they doe, they should not have laid that as a foundation of their Argument:) But, if they will argue from it, as not onely a true, but as a reciprocall Proposition, and an adequate Definition of a Prestytery; we defire they would first owne it as fuch, and we shall make use of it in due time: if not, they must not take that as granted on both fides, which neither the Assembly, nor Themselves admit.

They adde, 2. Wherein confists the sufficiency of a Presbytery? The number of how Many Elders is not set or bounded by Institution. Suppose Two or Three; and, if more be requisite, in a particular Congregation, there may be Four or Five. And a Presbytery over many Congregations is acknowledged to be sufficient, though it consist of no more. If they have this power as a sufficient Presbytery, why not the other also? have they their power.

er

er onely as having relation to many Congregations? Is that the effentiall requisite to their sufficiency? Here are Elders, and as many Elders, having relation to a Church; and, the Argument used by the Reverend Assembly to prove a Presbytery over man; Congregations, is, that Elders are mentioned in relation to one Church.

Answ. The number of Elders (say our Brethren) is not set, or bounded by institution. Very true, therefore, say we; There may be more Elders in a Presbytery, then those of one Congregation. And, if there may be. Then, so often as it may conduce to the generall good of the Church, and the better edification of the whole body of Christ, it is requisite that there be more, if conveniently they may be had; And, consequently, those of one fingle Congregation, not to assume to themselves all and sole power-For, where there are no particular bounds fet by Institution, there the generall rules of Scripture must take place, for the ordering of such particulars so as reay tend most to the Edification and Good of the Whole Body of Christ. Onely (upon this occasion) we defire our Brethren to remember what they affirmed in their Reasons against Subordination of Assemblies. That there must be the greatest and most Expresse Warrant and Designment for them in the Word, both for their Subordination and Number, and for their Bounds and Power, or else they might not be owned: And, (comparing that Rule with their Affertion here) to confider, whether it had not need of some Limitation.

Upon this supposition our Brethren argue, That there may be Two on Three, yea Four or Five Elders in a single Congregation; and, the number of Elders in a Presbytery not being set or bounded, it cannot be denied but these may be sufficient to make a Presbytery. But this, if granted, doth not prove it requisite that there should be no more, where more may be had conveniently; or, that All Presbyteries must be reduced to the minimum quad sic; and, in that capacity, assume all and sole power.

But, say they, a Presbytery over many Congregations is acknowledged

to be sufficient, though they consist of no more.

Answ. If they meane, no more then two or three, we hardly beleeve, either that there are any such Classicall Presbyteries; or, if there be, that they are acknowledged sufficient; Yea, though they should meane no more then four or five, if that number be made up of Preaching and Ruling Elders together. But, if they suppose those Four or Five to be all Ministers of the Word; we believe that it will be a case so rare, to sinde a particular Congregation surnished with so many able Ministers, as that we need not trouble our selves much at present to make a Rule for such a Case, but may deferre it, till that case falls out. Onely, we thinke, that, while that Congregation remaines so well surnished they will have

Ddd 3

no great occasion to ordaine more for themselves; and, that they assume all and sole power to ordaine for others, we suppose our Brethren will not assume.

But, say our Brethren, if they (a Classical Presbytery confishing of four or five) have this power as a sufficient Presbytery, why not also the other, (a Presbytery in a single Congregation consisting of as many?)

Answ. If, by this power, they meane, all and sole power in Ordination, we (for reasons before alleadged, both here, and in what we have said about Subordinations,) deny it, even of such a Classical Presbytery, if they have Opportunity and Conveniency of Associating with others.

And, if at any time, either They, or a larger Presbytery, may assume all and sole power in Ordination, it is not quatenus a sufficient Presbytery; but, quatenus the whole number of those who can conveniently associate.

As, if in a remote Island (or in a like case) such a Classicall Presbytery as they speake of, where they cannot have opportunity to associate with other Churches, may assume All and Sole power of Ordination for their owne Churches; we would not say that they do this quaterus a sufficient Presbytery, or quaterus so many; but, quaterus all that can conveniently associate; and that, if they had opportunity of associating with more, they ought, notwithstanding such a sufficiency, so to do.

In like manner, if in a particular Congregation, according to our Brethrens principles, there were such a Presbytery as our Brethren speak of, they would say, (we believe) that this Presbytery might assume all and sole power of Ordination or of Government in that Congregation; but not quaterus a sufficient Number; or quaterus Five, but, quaterus All the Elders of that Congregation; for if to these five there shall be fix more added, they will not say that the first five have (now) all and sole power; but, that the other six have their share in it also: not but that those sive be now as many, and as sufficient as they were before, and as sufficient to constitute a sufficient Presbytery as before; but, because they are not all, as before they were. So that, what power they had before, they had it not quaterus so many; but, quaterus the whole number.

Therefore the decision of the Question, Whether a particular Congregation, or the Eldership of a particular Congregation may assume all and sole power in Ordination, doth not so much depend upon this, Whether that they have a number sufficient to do the worke; but on this, Whether

They be the onely persons concerned, or interessed in it.

Wherefore, that which follows, [Have they their power onely as having relation to many Congregations? &c.] might have been spared. For, if there were but one Congregation of Christians in the world, They should have all and sole power; not, as being but one Congregation; but, as being the Whole Church.

As

As for the Argument of the Assembly, (to which the Breilven refer) proving one Presbytery in servalem over the many Congregations there, because they are all mentioned as one Church; what advantage it produceth to our Brethren, in the present businesse, we cannot yet perceive. But as it served then, to prove many Congregations, to be under one Presbytery; so may it be of like use here, to prove, that single Congregations are not to assume all, and sole power in Ordination.

## The Answer to their Second Argument.

Their Second Argument lies thus. That which two Apostles leing jogned together, might doe in a particular Congregation, that ordinary Elders may doe in a particular Congregation: But, Paul and Barnabas ordained Elders in particular Congregations, though they might Associate. There-

fore, &c.

Ans. This Argument concludes not at all against the Proposition. The Proposition sayes, It is not requisite that they assume all, and sole power in Ordination. The Argument concludes, That they may Ordaine; not, That they may assume all, and sole power; much lesse, That it is requisite for them so to doe. Our Brethren we think will not deny, but that Paul alone, being an Apostle, might Ordaine; and yet they suppose that Barnabas joyned with him: And if he, who might alone Ordaine, did not think it requisite to assume all and sole power in it, but joyned with Barnabas therein, having opportunity and convenience so to doe; why should it be more requisite now, for the Elders of a particular Congregation, to disclaime the conjunction of others with them, when it may be had conveniently, and to assume all and sole power to themselves? And this we may the better infift upon, because it hath been sometime urged (as a ground of our Brethrens opinion concerning Non-communion of Churches) that there was the same relation between Apostles, as there is between Churches; and therefore, that the example of Pauls departing from Barnabas, Alts 15. (whom yet he might not excommunicate, because the Apostles were all equall, and one had not power over another;) may be a president of One Churches Pronouncing a Sentence of Non-communion against Another Church, which yet (because of the parity between them) they may not excommunicate. Now, if Pauls denying Communion (as our Brethren suppose) with Barnabas, may be a president for one Church to deny Communion with another; Why should not Pauls joyning with Barnabas in Ordination, be as good a president for a like conjunction of Churches? And, if Paul, who might himself Ordaine alone; thought it requisite to joyn with Barnabas, when he might conveniently; Why

Why should not a particular Eldership (though they had, as our Brethren suppose, a power to ordaine alone) think it as requisite to joyne with the Elders of other Churches, when they may conveniently? Can our Brethren think, that a particular Eldership of one Congregation, hath a greater Authority and Infallibility then Paul had? We have not yet forgotten what our Brethren told us (in their Reasons against alledging the instance of the Church of Jerusalem, for a patterne of I'resbyterial Government) That the Apostles had Singly the same Power which they exercised fountly, Act. 6. Yet they exercised it Together, because it fell out that they were Together, and it was FIT none of them should be excluded: Which doth not onely confirme what we have here faid before, upon the former Argument, That the Sufficiency of a single Presbytery to perform the all of Ordination, (if that were granted) is no reason, why it is not requisite for that Presbytery to Associate, when they may conveniently, and not assume all and sole power to themselves; (for, the Apostles had each of them a sufficiency of power; ) But it doth also confirme that Inference. brought from the Instance of Paul and Barnabas joyning in Ordination; (and which might be also brought from the Apostles joyning together in Act. 6. to ordain Deacons, and from Pauls joyning with ordinary Elders to ordaine Timothy, as our Brethren say he did, beside many other instances of like nature) That, if Faul and Barnabas not onely did joyne together; but, it was FIT they should doe so (because nufit that any of them (bould be excluded) though each had a sufficient power; then, it is not onely lawfull that Elderships of severall Churches may joyne, but fit or requisite that they doe associate, when they may conveniently

To the particular Propositions of the Argument we answer as followeth.

## To their Major.

For the Major Proposition, That which two Apostles being joyned together might do in a particular Congregation, that, ordinary Elders may do, in a particular Congregation] we appeale to our Brethrens conscience, Whether they believe it to be true. The Emphasis lyes in the words [being joyned together:] For, they will not say, That, what an Apostle might doe alone in a single Congregation, may be done by ordinary Elders in a single Congregation; because the Apostles did act many things (even in single Congregations) by a power Apostolical, not imitable by ordinary Elders; But, what two or more of them did performe, being joyned together, may (say they) be performed by ordinary Elders: As if, what ever the Apostles did, in Collegio, they did as ordinary Elders, or by a power

power common to them with ordinary Elders. If this be a truth now, then was it a truth also in the Ordination of Deacons, Also 6. (which our Brethren denyed, when the Assembly made use of that place, as appears in their Reasons against the Instance of ferusalem:) unlesse the same Proposition which is a truth when it makes for them, be a falshood when it is alledged against them. If our Brethren think it not to be a Truth; they should not here affirme it as such, and ground their Argument upon it; especially having there denyed it. But let us examine their proof of it.

The Consequence, say they, appears thus; If the Argument brought by the Reverend Assembly doe hold, viz. that when the Apostles met together for Ordination, or for ordering the affaires of the Church of Jerusalem, they met as ordinary Elders (which they have voted) then, i.e.

Ans. But, what if the Argument brought by the Assembly doe not hold? (As our Brethren think it doth not, for they there deny it.) What then should become of our Brethrens Proposition, which is built upon no other ground, but a Supposition which themselves will not grant?

Yea, suppose the Assembly had voted, what our Brethren here say they have, (somewhat like this, we consesse, they have voted) and that the Argument of the Assembly doth hold; Will our Brethren say (as they should have said, if they meant to prove their Consequence, as they call it, or major Proposition) that then, what two Apostles joyned together might doe, that ordinary Elders may doe? No: But all they say, is this, then surely, when Paul and Barnabas met to ordine Elders in particular Congregations, it is to be averred, that they met for that ast as ordinary Elders. But what is this to the proofe of the Major Proposition? there is not a word of Paul and Barnabas in the Major Proposition, (either joyning as ordinary Elders, or joyning at all;) but onely a Generall Assertion; that What two Apostles joyned together may doe in a particular Congregation, that ordinary Elders may do in a particular Congregation. Of which generall Proposition our Brethren give no proof at all.

For our own part (though our Brethren would seeme to ground this affertion upon somewhat voted by us) we cannot affert to the truth of it; because, though we think now as we did before, That the Apostles in the Ordination of Deacons, Ast. 6. did ast as Elders, or by a power common to them with Elders; and, That they are therein a patterne to be imitated by Elderships; yet we neither then did, nor doe now believe, That what ever two Apostles joyned together might performe, that ordinary Elders may performe (whether in a particular Congregation, or elsewhere:) Yea, in that very Instance, Asts 6. (as we told our Brethren then

Eee in

power common to them with Elders.

200

And we think our Brethren are of the same opinion; for, they there tell us, that in that very act (of Ordination) they must needs act as Apostles; for they doe not simply Ordaine the Men, but doe a new, by vertue of Apostolicall anthority, Institute the Ossice of Deacons, which none but the

Apostles could immediately, and at first, have done.

But, how this consistent with their present Assertion (that what two Apostles together might doe, ordinary Elders may doe) we cannot tell, but leave it to themselves to reconcile. The inserting of the words [in a particular Congregation] (which, whether they intended as a limitation or no, we cannot tell) will no way help it: for, if this erecting of a new Ossice, were not performed by them in a particular Congregation (as our Brethren think it was) yet doubtlesse, they cannot deny but it might have been; and, their Proposion speaks not onely of what two (or more)

Apostles dd, but what they might doe.

If our Brethren should desert this Generall Proposition, (as we think they have cause to doe) and urge onely thus much, That if the Apostles at Ferusalem, joyning together to ordaine Deacons, (whether it were a Church of one or more Congregations) did act as Elders, Then Paul and Barnabas joyning together to ordaine Elders, did act as Elders: Yet, even this inference would not hold; For there is a great difference between the Apostles performing ordinary acts of Elders, in an ordinary way at ferufalem, when it was a Church already conftituted and fetled: and that of Paul and Barnabas in the first erecting and constituting of Churches in places where before there were none, affixing Elders to them. So that, the latter being a work extraordinary, and more peculiar to the Apostles, whose great work it was to Plant the Gospell throughout the world, even in places where before it had not been heard of, may with much more reason be affirmed to be the exercise of an Apostolicall power, then that of performing Ordinary Acts of Government in an Ordinary may at ferufalem, where the Church had been fetled, an regularly governed for some time before. And thus much for their Major Proposition; we proceed next, to consider their Minor.

### To their Minor.

The Alinor (fay they) bath two parts, 1. Paul and Barnabas ordained Elders in particular Congregations. 2. That they might Associate. But, there is, or at least there should have been, a third thing in that ProPropositian, very material to their purpose (which it concerned them as well to prove as these two,) namely, That Paul and Barnabas were joyned together in that ordination; If not, it serves not their turne; for, they do not say, that what two Apostles might severally performe; but, what two Apostles being joyned together, might performe, may be performed by ordinary Elders: and yet, for ought our Brethren have shewed to the contrary, some of these Elders might be ordained by Paul, some by Barnabas, and not all by both joyntly; and, if so, the instance would not be at all to their purpose. But this we doe not insist

Yea, there should have been a fourth thing, somewhere added, if they would conclude against the Proposition, viz. that, they were the Elders of only one Congregation. For, we never denied that ordinary Elders, may ordaine Elders in a particular Congregation; nor, that a Classis or Synod of ordinary Elders, may ordaine Elders for a particular Congregation. But the thing in Controversie is, not what may be done IN a particular Congregation, but what may be done in it by their owne particular Elders alone, and is requisite so to be, notwithstanding the conveniency of an Association with others. And here, the Instance (in our apprehension) failes them exceedingly; for, though it were granted that Paul and Barnabus did ordaine as Elders; yet, who will fay they did it as the Elders of one Congregation Onely? they being as much Elders of all the neighbour Congregations, as of that one wherein our Brethren suppose them to have ordained? and (if they must be called an Eldership) they might as well be styled a Classicall, or (if you will) an Oecumenicall Eldership, as a Congregationall.

And then, a fift, and fixt thing should have been cast in to all the former; namely, Paul and Barnabas did not onely ordaine, but did assume all and sole power in Ordination; and, that it was requisite so to do, so as, no others might either challenge an interest, or be permitted to joyne with them therein. But, of these things (although very necessary to make cut their Argument) our Brethren say nothing. We proceed therefore to consider those two particulars which they endeavour to

prove.

upon.

<sup>1. &</sup>quot;That, these were particular Congregations wherein they ordained Elders appears (say they) because its not supposeable that the Cities, much "lesse the regions round about, where the Apostles preached and erested Churches (as appears by Acts 13. 49. compared with Acts 14. 6. 21, 22, 23.) "were growne to many Congregations before the Apostles appointed Elders cover them. For the Apostles who were to preach in all places, would not E 2

" stay so long in one place: and, it was their course, when there were inavoi,

" as at Derbe, Acts 14. 3 1. to set Elders to them:

Answ. When our Brethren say in the first part of their Minor, that Paul and Barnabas ordained Elders in particular Congregations; they intend it, we suppose, in one of these two senses, Either (first) that the act of Ordaining was by Paul and Barnabas performed in particular Congregations; referring the words in particular Congregations (in their proposition) to the word Ordained; and the words, nar' ennanciar, (in Alts 14. 23. resolovisavres de autois recogutéges nat ennanciar) to the word xelegotown taut s, understanding it thus, that Paul and Barnabas did at each of these places, (Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch) falt, pray, ordaine Elders, and commend them to the grace of God. And it will not at all prejudice our cause to allow them this sense: For we shall say that Paul and Barnabas did ordaine Elders in each of those Congregations, by a power which they had equally respecting all of them, (like as when a Classicall Eldership doth ordain an Elder in a particular Congregation) and not that they were ordained by a full and fole power residing in each of those Congregations, in which those Ordinations are supposed to be performed: And that the rather because it is not faid that each Congregation or Church did ordaine Elders for themselves, But, that Paul and Barnabas did ordaine Elders for them; and the power of Paul and Barnabas was as much extrinsecall to each of the Churches, and as little confined to them, as the power of a Classicall Eldership, to each particular Congregation within their limits. But if our Brethren thus interpret the words nar' 'ennanoian, to denote the different places wherein those Elders were ordained; they cannot well urge the words nar' ennancian to be restrictive of their power, as if they were onely weed butien nat' ennancian, each of them Elders in their owne particular Church only, and had not power at all out of their owne Congregations to joyn with the Elders of other Churches to act in common for the good of them all.

Or else (secondly) they mean it in this sense, That, the Elders Ordained by Paul and Barnabas were settled in particular Congregations; referring the words in particular Congregations to the word Elders; and the words nat' 'enannalar to the word ageosurges, or to the word autois, understanding it thus, that Paul and Barnabas ordained Elders for them (nat' 'enannalar) respective, viz. for each Church their own Elders: And this seemes rather to be their meaning, because that all along in the pursuit of this Argument, they do promiscuously use the phrase of Ordaining to them and Ordaining in them: And this interpretation also we may without prejudice allow them. For, as we conceive it much con-

ducing

ducing to edification, that where the numbers of B leevers are great, or their habitations far distant, they should for more convenience be distributed into severall Congregations; so we judge it likewise conducing to edification, that each of those Congregations should have one or more appointed over them to take the speciall care of them: But, that the power of the Pastors or Elders in those severall Congregations, should be so limited each to the peculiar care of his own particular Congregation, as that they may not joyn and act together, in things of common concernment for the good of all of them, our Brethren, we suppose, will not be able to prove; and what they have produced to that purpose, in their Reasons against the joyning of many Congregations under one Presbyteriall Government, and against the Subordination of Assemblies for Go-, vernment; we have in our Answers thereunto already considered. But if our Brethren would be understood in his latter sense; they do very much vary from the thing in hand; For the thing which at present we are inquiring after is not, For whom, but By whom, these Elders were Ordained: and this, though granted, will no way prove, that they were Ordained each of them by a full and sole power residing in one Congregation only. We say likewise, that if they understand ROT' SKRAHOTON in Acts 14. 23. in this latter sense, (to denote the Charge to which those Elders were appointed) then there is nothing in the text concerning the particular place wherein the Ordination was performed'; those Elders might, for ought appears to the contrary, be all ordained at one Time and Place, when Paul and Barnabas at their departure out of those parts commended them to the grace of God; at which might be present, if not more Congregations, yet at least Nembers of more Congregations. then one.

We say therefore in generall, to this first part of their Minor, That, whether it be taken in the one sense or in the other, it makes nothing to the present purpose; For we are not now inquiring, either in what Place or to what Charge, but by what Authority, Elders then were or now may be Ordained: And therefore we might spare the paines of Examining the three proofs which they bring for the Construction of it; Since that it is no more then what is ordinarily practised by Classicall Elderships, who do in a particular Congregation ordaine Pastors for a particular Congregation; Though yet others may be and often are present beside those that are Members of that one particular Congregation; and those ordained for particular Congregations, are likewise to take care in Common for things that do concern many Congregations. Yet the three proofes which they have produced we will examine in order.

For the first Reason, wherein they alledge that it is not supposeable that these Cities and the regions round about were grown to many Congre-

gations before the Apostles appointed Elders to them.

We Answer. If they meane onely, That there were not in each City. and each Village of the regions adjacent, many Congregations before the Apostles appointed Elders: We thinke so too. But, if their meaning be, that in those Cities and the regions adjacent, taken altogether (colle-Etive,) there were not many Congregations before the Apostles ordained Elders to them; the text is manifeltly against them: Because. though there be mention of Preaching the Gospell in Antioch of Pisidia, in Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, and the regions about, Alts 13. 14.49. Alt.14. 6, 8, 20. yet, we read not of any forming of them into distinct Churches and ordaining of Elders to them, till they had been at all those places. Acts 14. 21, 23. and, by that time, there was not onely a competent number of Disciples to make a Congregation, but a competent number of Congregations too, to make a Classis. And it will be hard for our Brethren to prove, either that there were no more present at the Ordination of each of those severall Elders, then those of that one particular Congregation wherein he was to be placed; or, That they were fo confined each to the care of his owne particular Congregation, as that they might not at all joyne in the common care of all.

2. "Againe (say they) this was the first Ordination of Elders to those "places, and therfore must needs be to particular Congregations; for, a

" Classis is made up of the Elders of many Congregations.

Ans. We deny not but that they were appointed to particular Congregations as their more peculiar charge; but, it doth not follow, that therefore the Elders of these particular Congregations were not as well in common to take care of the whole that concerned them all, as each in particular of his owne speciall charge; or that they were ordained in a particular Congregation without the presence or assistance of any others: much lesse that they were ordained by a particular Congregation, assuming all and fole power in ordination. They might be ordained to a particular Congregation, though they were ordained In ameeting of many Congregations, and By the Elderships of many Congregations, united. Nor doth it follow, that they were Elders to particular Congregations onely; for, they might well, as a Classis, take care of the whole in matters of joint concernment, and yet each in their owne Congregation deal in those things that did more particularly concern them. For a Classis is made up of the Elders of many Congregations, as our Brethren themselves speake. But, how it should prove that they were not a Classis, because

Elders to particular Congregations, or, because it was the first ordination of Elders in those places, we doe not understand. For, what hinders, but that, at the same time, they might be appointed both in common to take care of the whole; and, in particular, each of his owne particular Congregation; and so, to endeavour both singly, and joyntly, to the utmost of their power, the good of all and every of those Congregations, as opportunity and occasion should be offered? Indeed, if, as soone as there were Disciples converted in one City or Village, the Apostles had affixed Elders to them (and to them onely) before there had been any converted in a second place: and then, at that second place, had ere-Red a Church and Elders to them, and them onely (independent on that former Church) before any had been converted in a third or fourth place; and so had constituted in each place a Church and Elders so difinet as to have no dependence on, or entercourse with any other Church, which either was already, or should afterwards be erected: if thus (we fay) they had done, there were some reason why our Br: might bring fuch a consequence as this: But, if they thinke it was so, they greatly miltake : for we read not either of erecting and forming of a diltinct Church, or of ordaining Elders in any of those places, til there were disciples converted in all of them, as is undeniably manifelt by the whole series of the 13. and 14. Chapters. And therefore, that supposition, that it was their course when there were inarci, (persons met to make up a Congregation or Church) presently to set Elders to them, is built upon the fand : And the contrary is evident; for though at Iconium Alls 14.1. there were, not only iravois but word want of, a great multitude. vet there is no mention of Ordination, till afterwards.

"Lastly (say our Brethren) they ordained Elders κατ' εκκκησίαν, and a divisis; and, at their ordaining, they fasted and prayed, commending the mto the grace of God; which fasting and praying being (according to the principles of both) to be in particular Congregations, it followeth, that the Churches to which these Elders were appointed, were particular Congregation.

Answ. If they would prove what they undertook, They should have said, therefore they were ordained In these particular Congregations; or rather, that they were ordained Bx particular Congregations, not, that they were ordained To particular Congregations: We never denied that the Churches, to which they, (at least some of them) were ordained might be particular Congregations, no more then we do deny that Ministers ordained by Classis, or Synods, be ordained to particular Congregations; and yet, the authority by which, and the Assem-

bly, or meeting in which they were ordained might be more then of one particular Congregation; And, if the many thousands at fernsalem, who were converted before the Ordination of Deacons Acts 6. yea, all the myriads converted there before Pauls comming to ferfalem Acts 21. (which was a long time after) were no more then might conveniently meet together in one place for all ordinations as our Brethren would have us to beleeve; they will give us leave, we hope, to thinke it possible, if not probable, that the beleevers converted by Paul and Barnabas in so short a time, at Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe, were not so numerous but that they, or at least more then one particular Congregation of them, might meet together in one place at the Ordination of Elders: at least divers Brethren from severall Congregations might be present at it. What they alleadge (that Fasting and Prayer are, according to the principles of both, to be in particular Congregrations) makes nothing to the contrary: for, if they meane no more but this, That there may be Fasting and Prayers in a Particular Congregation; or, That sometimes a particular Congregation is to fast and pray; we doe not deny to accord to our principles: But, if they intend, That there may no more joyn together in Fasting and Prayer then those of a particular Congregation; or, That feverall Congregations may not lawfully joyne together in it; it may perhaps be according to our Brethrens principles, but not according to ours. That they ordained Elders nat' ennanciar, and autois, we grant; they ordained Elders for those of Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch; these being the autoi for whom the Elders were ordained: and those Elders so ordained had their particular Congregations assigned them nar' ennerian, where they were principally to attend; it being most conducing to the generall good of beleevers, that they should be distributed into severall Churches or Congregations, and have particular Pastors appointed over them. Neverthelesse this doth not at all hinder, but that besides the particular care which each had of his owne charge, they might all of them joyntly have common care of the whole.

But how this or any thing else that can be made out of that Text, doth contribute ought to our Brethrens purpose, we do not see. For, if it were granted, That they were ordained in particular Congregations, it would not at all advance their cause, unlesse they prove withall, That Onely a particular Congregation had to doe in it: because it is not so much materiall, in what place they be ordained, as, by what authority: and, if a Classicall Presbytery do ordaine Elders in a particular Congregation, it cannot be therefore said, that the particular Congregation doth assume all and sole power in it. And so, though Paul and Barnabas,

(who were as much Elders to all these Congregations, as to any one of them) did in some one Congregation ordaine Elders, it cannot be thence inferred That this One Congregation did either assume or execute all and sole power in it; perhaps, not any power (further then of Assent,) for, it is not said that they did ordaine, but that Paul and Barnabas did ordaine for them.

2. "For the second [that they might associate] it appears (say they) because there were Churches in the Regions round about. And yet the A"postles mention no Association (which they would have done if that had been the way:) for When they did things with ordinary Elders, it is thus recorded, The Apostles and Elders. But, they commend them to the grace of God, as Paul did the Church of Ephesus, Acts 20.32. as having sufficient means to perpetuate succession, and to ordaine other Elders, if any

" should die, as also to build them up unto eternall life.

Answ. If they meane, That the Apostles might affociate: We think fo too; and, not onely, That they might, but That they did affociate and joyne with every Church where they came, at least with these Churches, to whom they actually ordained Elders: and we suppose our Brethren will not deny it. If they mean, That the Churches might associate; neither do we in this contradict them; for, we believe they might, and did affociate: but, we thinke they contradict themselves in it: for, they argued even now, that this being the first Ordination of Elders to those places, it must therefore needs be to particular Congregations; whereas, if these Churches, even in this first ordination of Elders to them, might associate (as our Brethren now fay,) where then lieth the necessity of this inference, That it must needs be to particular Congregations, because it was the first ordination of Elders to those places? They would first prove, That the Apostles ordained Elders to particular Congregations, because it was impossible they should associate; and now, they would prove, That they did not affociate, though they might.

They might affociate (say our Brethren) because there were Churches

in the regions round about.

Answ. That there were Beleevers in the regions thereabout, we grant, because Acts 13.49. mentioneth the whole region, only the country as well as the Town of Antioch; and Acts 14.6. mentioneth the region round about, the week weev, as well as the Cities of Derhe and Lystra; divers of the Country people thereabout beleeved the word, as well as those that dwelt in the Cities mentioned. But, it is not said, there were Churches in the regions round about, and that there were Elders affixed to them, who might joyne with Paul and Barnabas in ordaining Elders

Fff for

for Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe; Nor is it likely that the regions about these Cities were by Paul and Barnabas sooner formed into Churches, and supplied with Elders, then the Cities themselves. And, when our Brethren said before, that this was the surface mentioned, nor the villages about them, had, before this time, Elders ordained to them; and not, That there had been a sormer Ordination of Elders for those villages, though not for the Cities themselves. If they thinke otherwise, they might have done well to have shewed the reasons why they thinke so; for we may as well say, That there is no mention of such Churches and Elders; as, they, That there is no mention of Association with them.

As for the Affociation of these Churches: we believe, That the word avolois [ for them,] takes in, not onely the Cities of Antioch, Iconium, Derbe and Lystra, but the week xwest also, the region round about them, as appendices to them; and, That, the Ordination here spoken of, is the first Ordination of Elders, either for the Cities, or the villages about them: and therefore, though the Churthes within these consiners might, and (as we conceive) did associate among themselves; yet, that there were other Churches already formed, with whom they might thus conveniently associate, and whose Elders might joyne with Paul and Barnabas,

in ordaining Elders to these Churches, doth not appear.

Now, if the Elders of all these Churches were ordained at once, either at an Assembly of all these Churches (if their members or distances were not fo great, but that they might conveniently meet; ) or, of Brethren from all or diverse of them; the reason then is plaine, why there is no mention of the Elders of some of these Churches joyning with the Apostles in ordaining Elders to some other of them; because before this joynt ordination of Elders to all of them, there were no Elders in any of them: and, of any other persons, who are not Elders, either ordaining alone, or joyning in ordination with others (what ever our Brethrens principles about it may be) the Scripture is wholly filent. Nor is there any thing in the text to the contrary, but that they might be ordained all at once, if nat' innancian be to be interpreted of the Charge to which they are appointed, as our Brethren seem to take it; For, it speakes but Once of Ordaining Elders, and that as one of the last acts done by Paul and Barnabas before their departing out of these coasts; and, joyned with their commending them to God, or solemn taking leave of them, (according as the same or a like phrase is used Atts 20. 32. as our Brethren observe, and Alts 15. 40.) Yea, our Brethren themselves say, they ordained Elders, and, at their ordaining, they fasted and prayed, commending them

THEREBY

THEREBY to the grace of God; making it as it were one act. Neither can it be inferred from their having diffinit Charges, that therefore they were ordained in different places; For, it is not necessary that the Elders must be ordained either in the presence of that people, amongst whom they are to reside, or in the place of their residence. Nor do we thinke our Brethren will contend for it, if they be still of opinion, that the Imposition of hands on Paul and Barnabas, Acts 13.3. was an Ordination: for, neither was that Antioch the place, nor those then present the people, to which they were then sent forth: And our Brethren adde here, they commended them to the grace of God as Paul did the Church of Ephesus, Acts 20. 32. Yet was not Paul then at Ephesus, but at Miletus; nor was the whole Church of Ephesus there present, but only the Elders of Ephesus, and perhaps some Brethren accompanying them.

But, if our Brethen would rather suppose, That next enrich in Acts 14. 23. doth denote not so much the distinction of Charges to which, as the difference of places in which they were ordained, and That these Elders were not ordained all at one time and place, but that Faul and Barnabas did first in one Church ordaine Elders to them and commended them to the grace of God; and then, in a second, ordaine Elders for them, commending them to the grace of God; and so of the rest: and, if, upon this supposition, they will aske, Why those Elders ordained for the first, did not assist in ordaining Elders for a second Church; and, the Elders of both these, assist in ordaining others for a third, and fourth Church, & so of the rest? We say, That our Brethren have not yet shewed but that they did so, and none of their three reasons, which they produced to make good the first part of their minor, will prove the contrary.

But, say they, the Apostles mention not Association. Answ. True; nor do the Apostles Mention that which is mentioned; for, Luke was the Writer of this History, not the Apostles; They are but part of the History. And 2. suppose it were mentioned at all in this place; There be many things that the Apostles do not mention, (either here or any where else) which yet our Brethren would faine have allowed in their way. The Apostles do not mention (no more doth Luke) That each of these single Congregations did assume all and sole power in Ordination; yet our Brethren, it seemes, thinke they did: The Apostles do not mention, That the people without the Elders may ordaine an Elder; or, That the people may soyne with the Elders in imposition of hands; yet perhaps some of our Brethren, if not all of them, thinke it may be done: The Apostles do not mention Non-Communion of Churches: Nor a Church Covenant: Nor such elective Synods, as our Brethren contend for (beside many other that might be mentioned:) But our Brethren will not thence infer,

Fff 2

That therefore these things either were not, or, ought not to be; because the Apostles, without mentioning of these, commended them to the grace of God, as having sufficient meanes to perpetuate succession, and to ordaine other Elders, if any should die, as also to build them up unto eternall life.

But, say our Brethren, this they would have done (viz. mentioned Asfociation) if this had been the way; for, when they did things with ordinary

Elders, it is thus recorded, The Apostles and Elders.

Answ. Sometimes it is so recorded, but not alwayes. In 2 Tim. 1.6. Paul only is mentioned to have imposed hands on Timothy; and yet our Brethren thinke, from 1 Tim. 4. 14. that the Eldership joyned with Paul in it. And, why may not Paul and Barnabas as well be said here to ordaine Elders for each Church (without mentioning others) though others also, in some Churches, might joyne in the action? Especially considering that, in the first of these Churches, there could not be a conjunction of other Elders, because, as yet, no other were ordained: And therefore, though the Elders first ordained might afterward joyn in ordaining Elders for other Churches; yet, it could not be faid, even upon that supposition, That Paul and Barnabas with the Elders of neighbour Churches, did ordain Elders for each Church; because, in the first Church at least, Paul and Barnabas must be supposed to ordaine alone, and not in conjunction with other Elders of neighbour Churches: but, That Paul and Barnabas did ordaine Elders, for each Church, might well be said :

though, in some Churches, other Elders joyned with them.

Againe, it may be very probably conceived, That not only Paul and a Presbytery of ordinary Elders joyned in this ordination of Timothy; but, that Barnabas, or Silas, or some other joyned likewise; though neither the first, nor the second Epistle to Timothy (nor any other place) do expressely mention it. The first time that we find Timothy mentioned, is Alts 16. when Paul and Silas comming to Derbe, and Lystra, found Timothy there: but, how long he had been there before this time, we cannot tell. Perhaps he might be one of those whom Paul and Barnabas ordained Alts 14. 23. and he continued there an Elder, till Pauls next comming: And, if so; then have we not only Barnabas joyned with Paul in this ordination, but also the thing that our Brethren enquire after, viz. Elders affociated with Paul and Barnabas in ordaining Elders at least to some of these Churches. Or, if Timothy were not at that time ordained by Paul, it is likely, that at his next coming to Derbe and Lystra, Chap. 16. finding Timothy there, resolving to take him as a companion of his journey, he would ordaine him; and whom can we then suppose to be the Eldership then joyning with him, but those of Derke, Lystra, and Iconium, (of whom expresse mention is made Alts 16.1.) and, probably

bably, those of Antioch too. So, that, at least by this time, we may find these Elders associated, if not with Paul and Barnabas, yet with Paul and Silas, which is all one: For, why Silas (who was a Prophet as appears AELs 15.32.) should not be thought to joyne with Paul, in Timothies ordination, as well as the ordinary Elders of those places, we see no reason; and yet we find not him expressely mentioned as joyning therein, though we cannot thinke that he was excluded. Or, if Timothy were not yet ordained by Paul, but at some time after, (though we see no reason to thinke that his ordination was longer deferred) yet when ever it was, it is probable, that Silas or some other of like quality accompanying Paul in his travailes, (who did not usually travail without some such companion,) did joyne with him in the ordination of Timothy. So that in a matter of Fact, of this nature, it is no good argument to conclude negatively, because the history doth not in every place, make mention of it.

And thus we have answered the Arguments, produced by our Brethren as the Reasons of their Dissent from this Proposition. But, whereas the Assembly had, to their Proposition, annexed this Proof, viz.

1. "Because, There is no Example in Scripture that any single Congregation which might conveniently associate did assume to it selfe all and sole tower in Ordination; neither is there any Rule which may warrant such

" a practise.

2. "Because There is in Scripture, Example of an Ordination in a Presbytery over divers Congregations; as in the Church of Jerusalem, where were many Congregations, these many Congregations were under one Pres-

"bytery, and this Prefbytery did Ordaine.

Our Brethren are pleased to take no notice of this proof at all, nor do they alledge any thing against the strength of it. But for what reasons they chose rather to wave it, then to object against it, themselves best know.

Concordat cum Originali.

Adoniram Byfield, Scriba.

FINIS.

The transfer of the same of th STATE OF THE STATE and the public of the second e de la la grada de la mini de la grada de la constante de la 2-21 - 15-17, 8 TARL.

#### ERRATA.

### In the dissenting Brethrens Reasons.

PAg. 1. lin. 8. read, one, p 2. l 18. r relation. p 7. l 29. r distinguish. p 10. l 2. dele ist l 30. r related. p 11. l 29. r similarly. p 16. l 4. r a. τρώπων. l 23. r π εγω νατοινών l 33. r πυντίς εθνους. p 20. l 10. r μύσιον. p 22. l 18. r understood. p 24. l 20. r so. p 38-l 22. r administration. p 39 l 13. r Parachal p 40. l 10. r Prestriers.

### In the Assemblies Answer.

Pag. 6.lin. 18. read, one particular frist. p 13.l 37. r 1 Tim. 5. 17, 18. p 16.l 2. r accept p 21.l 9. r mustrust. p 22.l 17, 18, 19, 20. point thus, some acts: as for choosing Officers, so their first instance and their fifth; for making Decrees, so the sixth; for bearing, so the second and third; p 35.l 6. r rivau nuveralses.l 23. & 26. r nuveralses.l 35. r nuveralses. in the margine r appeals. p 52. l ult. r imitated. p 68.l 29. r enst. l 30. r if they be able, we. p 71.l 38. r appeals p 82 l 25. r Arts. p 91.l 32. r dianely superos. p 94.l 6. r the Franke, according to Beza., bat. l 16. r whereas as we. l 30 r there. p. 95.l 11. r 50000.l 14. r Hebraum. p 97. marg. r 97. and so in order to 105. p 98.l 37. r other arguments, there then. p 99.l 21. r Chronologie. p 100.l 24. r ALL.

In the diffenting Brethrens Reasons against the Subordination, &c.

Pag. 123. in the title r Synodal 7. r which makes. p 124. l 37. r must be. p 130. l 35. dele the. p 131. Title r Synods.

In the Assemblies Answer.

Pag. 137. 14. r for Government. p 140. 132. r them. 131. t rechoned after Apostles. 1 ult. r is. p 142. 11. r ratione. p 144. 17, 11. dele the Interrogative points. p. 149. 118. r as well as. p 154. 118 r nothing. p 161. 15. dele be. p 182. 137 r them. p 183. 118. r be. p 185. 131. r all power of. p 186. titler the Answer of the Assembly of Divines. 112. r an.

In the dissenting Brethrens Reasons against Ordination.

Pag. 191. 127. and 29. r met. p. 192. 17. r Ennisitas.

### In the Assemblies Answer.

Pag. 185. read, 195. and so answerably in the rest that follow. p 203. 133. r so.

### In the papers of Accommodation.

Pag. 18. 16. r pursued. p 19. l. 4. dele 10. p 22. l 2. r pariake. l 19 r Classis. p 28. l 13. 14. r with in any thing. p 30. & 31. r 30. 31. p 39. l 8. r good. p 46. l 6. r with. l 10. r have found, the. l 21. r doth not onely lay. p 47. l 15. r necessity to recede. p 50. l 20. r the. p 55. r 53. p 54. l 15. dele the Interrogative point. p 55. l 5. r our ministers, in their. p 57. l 29 r exclude them; and. p 71. l ult. r from us: the same. p 82. l 19. r Tutor. p 87. l 17. r Classes, p 89. title, dele of. p 90. l 19. r Chatechisme. p 96. l ult. r said. p 102. l 20. r argument. p 107. l 16. r it. p 116, 117. transpose the Titles.



Papers given to Gom. of Words + Commons etc.



## An Order of the House of Commons for A Committee of Accommodation.

Septemb. 13. 1644.

Hat the Committee of Lords and Commons appointed to treat with the Commissioners of Scotland, and the Committee of the Assembly, Do take into consideration the differences of the opinions of the mem-

bers of the Assembly in point of Church-government, and to indeavour an union if it be possible: And in case that cannot be done, to indeavour the finding out some way how far tender consciences, who cannot in all things submit to the same Rule, which shall be established, may be borne with according to the Word, and as may stand with the publike peace; That so the proceedings of the Assembly may not be so much retarded.



This honourable Committee met according to

the Order, Septemb. 20. following

He appointment of the Order Being, That the differences of opinions, of the members of the Assembly, in point of Church Government be taken into consideration. The honourable Committee appointed a Sub-Committee of six of the Members of the Assembly. Mr, Marshall, Mr. Hearle, Master Vines, Dr. Temple, Mr. Goodwin, and Mr. Nye, (two of the dissenting brethren) To consider of the differences of opinions in the Assembly, in point of Church-Government: And to bring in what might be matter for that grand Committee to consider of.

In pursuance of this, the said sub-Committee met, who stiled themselves the sub-Committee of Agreements. And after the Presace declaring their mutuall considence to agree in one Confession of Faith, and in One Directory of publique wor-ship, &c. They prepared severall Propositions, concerning the Government of particular Congregations, and Ordination, &c. Declaring how farre in practical principles they did agree therein, together with the different practices, which each according to their principles, desired.

At which the sub-Committee presented the Propositions they had prepared, declaring they had further to bring in concerning Classes and Synods. And what might be the way of accommodation for the dissenting brethrento enjoy Congregations amongst us, according to their principles. All which (though

they had met many dayes) was not as then perfected.

Therefore the honourable Committee did remit back to the faid sub-Committee the Propositions then brought in, to be further explained, and as much, as might to be perfected against

gainst the next meeting, adjourning that Committee untill

Tuesday October 15.

When these Propositions that follow, were brought in by the sub-Committee, as containing both a fuller explication, and the best way to accommodate their own and their brethrens principles in a practique way (which was the end of that honourable Committee) both for Congregations, and Synods, and the government thereof.

Commons, Divines of the Assembly, with the Scotch-Commissioners met. And these Propositions were read by Master

Vines who was the Chaire-man of that Sub-Committee.

A Vote was past in the Committee to take them into consideration. But that debate was not entred upon, because it was the earnest desire of some that the Rule should first be made complea to by the Assembly and the Houses.

And there was a Ceffation put upon the honourable Committee herein, by the honourable House of Commons untill their

further pleasure.

Let the Reader take notice, that in what particulars the dissenting brethren do differ from the Propositions of the rest of the Sub-Committee, or do expresse their desires a part from them, there is a differing Character put in the Printing of them for the discerning thereof, and that in other things wherein they expresse not any difference or further explanation, they agreed to them.

The Propositions were as followeth.

## At the Sub-Committee of Agreements.

N confidence that we shall jointly agree in one Confession of Faith, and in one Directory of the Publick worship of God, with the help of a Preface, we come according to our order to points of Government, and therein do agree as followeth.

1. That a particular congregation having such officers as the word of God holds out, both for preaching and governing, is a Church that hath power in all Ecclesiastical

effairs, which do only concern it selfe.

2. That these forementioned officers are to be so many in number, in every such congregation, as that three or two at the least may agree together in every act of government. By two at the least we mean preaching or governing officers. But some of the Committee do hold that a preaching Presbyter should concurre in the sentence of excommuni-

cation and suspension.

3. That these officers have power in those things which are voted by the Assembly to be due unto them, and in suspension and excommunication: Some of the Committee meaning that the major part of the officers have power to do it, the congregation not opposing it, in which case of opposition they hold sit that the officers do suspend the act. Others of the Committee saying that the Major part of the Officers have power to do it, if the Major part of the Brethren do consent unto it by their Votes: so as the negative lies in the major part, either of the Officers or Brethren.

And as for ordination, we all hold, that where there are two preaching Presbyters at least, such a Presbytery

may

may ordaine their own Elders. But some of the Committee do further sa, that where there are two ruling Elders at least, they have power of ordaining Elders for that congregation, and in case there be no Elders ( as at the first in Ecclesia constituenda ) then the choice of Elders, by the people, with approbation of the neighbouring Ministers with fasting and prayer, may

suffice.

4. That the Elders of the congregation shall advise with the Classis in all cases of Excommunication before they proceed to it, and the Classis hath power to heare and determine: yet so, as the power of the Congregation be not concluded thereby in matter of Excommunication. But some of the Committee do say that in what soever case they find difficult either in excommunication or in any other administration of their power, they shall first advise with some company or Classis of neighbour Ministers; as at the end of the foure following Propositions a fierwards.

5. For the affociating of Chirches, let there be in every County of this Kingdome, a certain number of select, godly and able Ministers of the word, within that County, to he are and determine the causes and differences in every congregation within the same, and let there be a certain number of select Church-governours assistant unto them: the first choyce of these to be made by the Parliament in such a way as they shall determine, and such number to have power of election from time to time of any Minister or Church-governour into any place among them, that is void by death or otherwise.

6. The Ministers and Ruling-governors, of every congregation within that County so associated, shall have power to debate and vote in that meeting from time to time in such cases as pertain to that particular congregation, except such of them as are complained of, or are parties in que-

Rion.

7. A certain number of the aforesaid Ministers, and Aaaa 3 Ruling-

Ruling-governours as do dwell near together, in the same Deanery or division of that County, and who may with conveniency more frequently meet together, shall have power to heare and determine the causes and differences within the severall congregations of that precinct.

8. Let Nationall Assemblies of Ministers and others, be chosen from time to time, according as shal be appointed by the Parliament, as the necessity of the Churches af-

fairs shall require.

To the fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth, the whole Committee doth ascent; onely some of them doe desire that the effect of that which hereafter followeth may for explanation sake be inserted viz. That the Elders and Brethren of each Congregation in case they find any thing too hard for themselves or have any controverse among themselves, may have liberty to advise with any of those select Elders, and others in the Province jointly or apart, or with the Elders of any other Churches, for the determining and composing the controverse or resolving of that difficulty, and in case they cannot be satisfied, then to have recourse also to the advice and help of that Classis unto which they appertain, to solve and determine it.

habit and live together within certain bounds and precincts of a parish under preaching and governing Officers: unto which jo far as it concerns the meer bounding of congregations some of the Committee do desire that these provisions may be

added.

1. That they may have liberty to dwell in another Parish if the consent of the Minister of that other parish be procured.

in from some one parish immediately adjoyning.

We having weighed our Brethrens Principles, do find no probability of accommodation for them, ordinarily to enjoy congregations, unlesse when it shall happen in a parish

that

that the Minister cannot administer the Sacraments to all in the Parish, whom possibly the neighbour Ministers or the Classis may judge sit to be admitted; such persons shall have power to procure to themselves the Sacraments, either by the help of a neighbour Minister, or some other prevision be made by a proportionable allowance out of the Tythes of the parish according to the wisedome of the State.

## Whereunto our Brethren adde as followeth.

Or otherwise if in a parish it happen that there be a considerable number of such as cannot partake in the ordinances with the Minister and people there, they shall have liberty to dispose of themselves as a distinct Church, and to choose a Minister or Ministers at their own charge to be maintained, to be their Pastor.

If such a liberty shall seem in the wisedome of this honourable Committee to be prejudiciall to the peace of the Church, as not to be permitted, we humbly desire the doctrinal principles wherein we differ about Church-government may be taken into serious consideration, and some other way of accommodation in practice thought upon, as shall seem sit to this honourable Committee.

## Concerning Classes and Synods.

- 1. At these meetings, let them pray, expound scripture, resolve difficult cases of conscience and preach the word.
- 2. They may dogmatically declare what the will of Christ is in such cases as are before them; And this judgment of theirs ought to be received with reverence, and obligation,

as from an ordinance of Christ. Some of the Brethren (though affenting) yet are bold to adde hereunto, that the judgment of any other, of those Elders in the province, or elsewhere, advised with, they doe in like manner looke at as the ordinance of Christs.

and to have the like obligation in them.

3. If the doctrine or practife of any particular congregation be erroneous, hurtfull or destructive to holinesse or the peace of that or other congregations, they are bound to give account thereof to the Classis or Synod. Some of the Brethren adde to this, That the ground of this obligation to give account to the Classis or Synod is their being offended, or their Churches

Scandalized thereat.

4. The Classis or Synod may examine, admonish, and in case of obstinacy declare against that congregation or any particular member in it, as the nature and degree of that offence shall require. Some of the Brethren affent to such proceedings as towards a Church offending and scandalizing of them: but adde, That no such examination, admonition in any Classis or Assembly be extended to any particular person in that Church, but unto the Churchit selfe, for not putting forth the power that Christ hatb given them for reforming him.

5. The Classis or Synod may judge touching any person who deserves excommunication, and may charge the severall congregationall Presbyteries whom it concernes to do it.

6. We conceive that in case the particular Eldership refuse to doe their duty, the Classis, may and ought not onely to withdraw communion from them, but also when need is, exercise the sentence of excommunication themselves. In stead of this fixth Proposition, some of the Brethren do insert this, In case the aforesaid particular Churches and Elderships offending shall refuse to submit to this course, that then the Classis or Synod are to acquaint their congregations respectively, and so withdraw from them, denying Church-Communion and fellowship with them.

7. In case of appeale if it appeare to the Classis that the

**fentence** 

fentence was unjust, they may judge that the particular Presbytery ought to reverse it: and in case they obstinately result to do it, the Classis may reverse it. Others of the Brethren only say that they are to proceed as in the former Article.

8. The Classis or Synod have power to ordaine Ministers for such congregations as have not a sufficient presbytery in them, and let all congregations associated, first advise with the Classis, and take their assistance before they ordain a Minister. Some of the Brethren do referre themselves for this, to the last clause in the third Proposition delivered in.

Bbbb

souther should have not been as the off of the lay a first March Street Parket Street all your IN IN IN

## THE

## PAPERS

AND

## Answers

OF THE DISSENTING BRETHREN

AND

The COMMITTEE of the Assembly of DIVINE s.

Given into the Honorable Committee of Lords and Commons, and Affembly of Divines with the Scotch Commissioners,

ACCOMMODATION,

At the REVIVING of that Committee.

1 6 4 5.

# The Order of the Lords and Commons for the Reviving of the Committee for ACCOMMODATION.

Die Jovis 6. Novemb. 1645.

Rdered by the Lords and Commons in Parliament Assembled, that the Committee of Lords and Commons appointed to treat with the Commissioners of Scotland, and the Committee of the Assemble 1982.

sembly, Do take into consideration the differences in opinions of the members of the Assembly in point of Church-government, and to indeavour an union if it be possible: And in case that cannot be done, to indeavour the finding out some way how farre tender consciences, who cannot in all things submit to the Common Rule, which shall be established, may be borne with according to the Word, and as may stand with the publike peace; That so the proceedings of the Assembly may not be so much retarded.

## The Lords Committees.

Earle of Northumberland, Earle of Manchester, Lord Vicount Say and Seale, Lord Wharton, Lord Howard.

## Novemb. 14. 1645.

Redered that the said Lords Committees, are to meet with a Committee of the House of Commons, on Munday next at three of the clock in the afternoon in Jerusalem chamber in the Colledge of Westminster, and that the Committee of the Assembly be there present.

John Brown Cler. Parliamentorum.

The Members of the Assembly who were a Committee for to meet with the Committee of the Lords and Commons appointed to treat with the Commissioners from the Church of Scotland, are as followeth.

Master Marshall, Doctor Burges, Master White, Doctor Hoyle, Doctor Temple, Doctor Smith, Master Palmer, Master Seaman, Master Herle, Master Goodwin, Master Nye, Master Bridge, Master Hill, Master Reynolds, Master Arrowsmith, Master Young, Master Vines, Master Tuckney, Master Newcomen, Master Simpson, Master Burroughs, Master Dury.

On the 17. of November, 1645. the Committees above mentioned, met in Jerusalem chamber, and did then order that those Divines of the Assembly, members of this Committee, who had formerly been a sub-Committee for this purpose should consider and prepare matter for the debate of this Committee at their next meeting,

which.

which meeting was then appointed to be Mun-

day the 24 of the same moneth.

Novemb. 24. 1645. The Committee met again, and the chair-man of the Sub-committee, declared that they had not prepared matter for their debate, according to their order, because the Dissenting Brethren, did wave the first part of the Order of the Houses touching accommodation, which though the rest of the Sub-committee could not assent unto, yet they lest it to the Dissenting Brethren, if they pleased to present their thoughts to this Committee, not as the result of the Sub-committee, but as their own, and accordingly the Dissenting Brethren did present a paper which is as followeth.

Novemb. 24. 1645.

The nature of the businesse puts us upon the second part of the Ordinance of Parliament. "The indeavou"ring to find out some way how farre tender conscien"ces, who cannot in all things submit to the Rule
"which shall be established may be born with, accor"ding to the Word, and as may stand with the pub"like peace, that so the proceedings of the Assembly may
not be so much retarded; which we humbly present to
the consideration of this Committee.

After some debate upon this paper it was Resolved upon the Question, that Master Goodwin,

Goodwin, Master Nye, Master Sympson, Master Bridge, and Master Burroughs, do bring in unto this Committee upon thursday seven-night, wherein they desire to be born with in point of Church-government, in all those things wherein they cannot submit unto the common Rule that is established.

December 4. 1645. The Committee met again, and the Dissenting Brethren presented their desires in a paper, as followeth.

Decemb. 4. 1645.

Agreeing in those things that containe the substance of the service and worship of God in the Directory according to the Preface; and being consident that we shall agree in the consession of faith, for as much as we doe agree with the Reformed Churches in the dottrine contained in their Confessions and writings as our Brethren doe, who differ from us in matter of discipline.

We humbly crave;

r.In relation to the Ordinance for giving power to Classical Presbyteries to ordaine Mini-

sters, Novemb. 10. 1645.

That where there is a Presbytery, (that is, two Elders at least) in any of our Congregations, there may be power of Ordination: and where there is not a Presbytery, those who are sufficiently qualified and

approved for their gifts and graces by godly able Ministers, being chosen by the people, and set apart for the Ministry, with prayer and fasting in the Congregation, may prima vice exercise their Ministry.

- 2. In relation to the Ordinance for the fetling of the Presbyterial Government. Aug 19.1645.
- 1. That our Congregations may not be brought under the Government of Classicall, Provinciall, or Nationall Assemblies, in respect of Ecclesiasticall Jurisdiction; but may be permitted to enjoy liberty as some priviledged and exempt places, formerly have been permitted to enjoy, in respect of the Ecclesiasticall Discipline, then exercised.

2. That our Congregations may have liberty to constitute their own Elder-ships, having a competent number of persons fitly qualified for Elders: and that all men who communicate in the Lords Supper, may

have liberty to choose their own officers.

3. That we may not be forced to communicate as members in those Parishes where we dwell; but may have liberty to have Congregations of such persons, who give good testimony of their Godlinesse and peaceablenesse, yet out of tendernesse of conscience cannot communicate in their Parishes, but do voluntarily offer themselves to joine in such congregations. Which, bow it may best stand with the peace of the Kingdome, we humbly leave to the consideration of this honourable Committee.

That all such congregations as are made up of such as do voluntarily joine themselvs, having an Eldership which themselves have chosen or accepted of, and submitted to, may have power of all Church-censures, and of the Administration of all Ordinances within themselves. Tet so as they submit to give an account of any of their proceedings, to whom the Parliament shall appoint.

This Paper being read and the day spent in

explayning it.

It was ordered, that the rest of the Divines, members of the Committee be made a Sub-committee to confider of the Paper of the Dissenting Brethren, given in, and to meet first betweene themselves, then with the Dissenting Brethren, and to prepare somewhat against the next meeting of this Committee which was resolved to be on Munday sevenight Decemb. 15. The Commissioners of the Church of Scotland were defired to affift the Sub-committee.

Decem. 15. 1645.

The honourable Committee met againe. And the Sub-Committee presented an answer to the Dissenting Brethrens Paper, which is as followeth. Cccc Although

## 18 The Answers of the Sub-Committee of Divines.

Although it woud have been a farre more comfortable and happy way, and more agreeable to the peace and edification of the Church, and a meanes to prevent the danger of Schisme and many other mischeifs; & which we have always much rather defired to have perfued, the method appointed by the Honourable Houses. And in the first place to have indeavoured an Accommodation: yet our Brethern professing that an Accommodation was now impossible, and that the nature and present state of the businesse doth lead them to desire a forbearance (in both which we yet humbly conceive they are mistaken) upon serious consideration had of their Paper to that purpole, we have found it needfull to premise these three particulars.

upon, we take it for granted upon our Brethrens Preface, that the same Directory for worship, & the same Confession of Faith, shall be imposed upon them in the same manner, as it is imposed upon us.

2. And therefore whosoever agrees not in those things that contains the substance of the service and worship of God in the Directory, according to the Preface; and shall not agree in the Confession of Faith, nor with the doctrine of the reformed Churches, contained in their confessions and writings, as we do, who differ from

these:

these Brethren in matters of Discipline, shall not have the benefit of this indulgence.

3. If any shall practice any thing contrary to the Directory, or to write, publish, or declare any doctrine contrary to the Confession of faith, he shall be liable to the same penalties, that we our selves are for the like offence.

Which things being premised, we have found it needfull and most consonant to the businesse, to take first into consideration, the third Proposition of our Brethrens particular desires under the Head of Presbytery, unto which all the rest have so necessary a relation, which they have offered to this Honourable Committee.

#### Concerning which we humbly conceive.

I. That this defire of our Brethren is not to be granted to them in terminis, for the reasons which we here withall humbly offer.

a. Because it holds out a plain and totall separation from the Rule, as if, in nothing, it were to be complyed with; not our Churches to be communicated with in any thing, which should argue Church-Communion; more could not be said or done against salse Churches.

2. It plainly holds out the lawfulnesse of gathering Churches out of true Churches, year C c c c 2 out

out of such true Churches which are endeavouring further to reforme according to the word of God: whereof we are assured there is not the least hint of an example in all the Book of God.

3. In granting this, the Parliament should grant liberty to destroy and pull down what themselves are endeavouring to set up:

4. The indulgence they seek is a greater priviledge then they shall enjoy who shall be under the Rule, as may appeare in severall particulars. I. Such as own the Rule, must live in the same Parish with the other members of their Church: These may live any where, and be of any Church they please, yea though a Church of their own way, were in the place where they live. 2. If such as live under the Rule would better themselves in living under the Pastorall charge of another Mini-ster, they must remove their dwelling; These need not.

tuall Schissine and division in the Church, fill drawing away some from the Churches under the Rule, which also would breed many irritations between the parties going away and those whom they leave; And againe, between the Church that should be

1 2 3 3 5

BUB

forfaken,

The Answer of the Sub-Committee of Divines. 21. forsaken, and that to which theyshould go.

6. This would introduce all manner of confusion, in families where the members were of severall Churches; and exceedingly, if not altogether hinder the mutuall edification that might be afforded and received amongst them. And especially in great families, it would be impossible for the Governours to have a suré account of all their families attending upon the Ordinances, when twenty of them may possibly be of twenty severall Churches; and much lesse take account of their profiting by the Ordinances.

II. That none are to be allowed upon differences only in matter of Government, to withdraw communion from us in things wherein they declare an agreement: But seeing it is consessed in Worship and Doctrine, we are one, and have covenanted to endeavour the nearest conjunction and uniformity, there may be no such indulgence granted to any as may constitute them in distinct separated congregations, as to these Parts of worship where they can joyn in communion with us, but only some expedient may be indeavoured how to be are with them in the particulars wherein they cannot agree with us.

I.II. For this purpose we humbly offer.

Cccc 3 1. That

## 22 The Answers of the Sub-Committee of Divines.

1. That such as through scruple or error of conscience, cannot joine to pertake of the Lords Supper, shall repaire to the Minister and Elders for satisfaction in their scruples, which if they cannot receive, they shall not be compelled to communicate in the Lords Supper, provided that in all other parts of worship, they join with the congregation wherein they live and be under the

government of that congregation.

2. That such as in this manner are under the Government of that congregation wherein they live, and are not Officers therein, being of the Independent judgement, shal seek satisfaction as in the former Proposition, which if they canot receive they shall not be compelled to be under the power of censures from Classis or Synods: provided that they continue under the government of that congregation, and that no man who hath submitted to Classis and Synods shall decline them in any case pendente lite.

These Papers of the Sub-Committee, in Answer to the dissenting Brethrens Papers, being thrice read after sundry Debates, it was resolved,

1. That the Brethren shall have a coppy of the Papersin Answer to theirs communicated to

them.

2. That they are to returne an Answer in writing

December 23. 1645.

The Honourable Committee met againe, and the differting Brethren presented an Answer in writing, which was read: first reading a Paragraph of the Sub-Committees Paper, and then a Paragraph of their Answer, in manner as followes.



An Answer to a Paper brought into this Honorable Committee by a Sub-committee of the Divines of the Assembly.

Decemb. 23. 1645.

#### As to the Preface.

Lethough it would have beene a far more comfortable and happy way, and more agreeable to the peace and edification of the Church, and a meanes to prevent the danger of Schisme and many other mischiefs; and which we have alwayes much rather defired to have pursued the Method appointed by the honourable Houfes; and in the first place to have endeavoured an Accommodation; yet our Brethren professing that an Acand present state of the businesse doth lead them to desire and present state of the businesse doth lead them to desire they are mistaken) upon serious consideration had of their Paper to that purpose, we have found it needfull to premise these three particulars.

Answ.

As Accommodation would have been more advantagious and safe for us, because it would have set us in the same state with our Brethren, so we have earnestly pursued it, and according to the Method appointed by the honorable Houses, we did in the first place endeavour an Accommodation, and in a Sub-COMMITTEE made a great progresse therein, which was presented to this honorable Committee 12 months fince; but the impediment to it was, the infifting on by our Brethren, that the Rulemust first be resolved upon; But now that the Rule is resolved on by the Assembly, and established by the Parliament (we having according to our consciences entred our Diffent unto, and given in Reasons to the Assembly against it) we cannot go on in the way of Accommodation according to the former Method; Because Accommodation is an agreement in one common Rule, and we doe not presume to seeke a new Rule to be made.

That impossibility of Accommodation which was spoken of, was, then, withall explained to be only in respect of the Rule, as now it is established: For otherwise as touching the nature of the thing simply considered without a supposition of such a Rule, either Voted by the Assembly, or established by the honorable Houses, we have from the beginning professed that we thought we and our Brethren did agree in common principles enough, and sufficient to have preserved ferved the Churches and Saints in these Kingdoms in peace. And when the honorable Houses renewed this Order, they having not seen (as we humbly conceive) the difference of our judgements in point of sub-ordination of Assemblies, and our Reasons against them, they might think, that we might accompand to with the Rule thank are set foutly

modate with the Rule they have set forth.

Neuther will such a forbearance as we seek endanger Schisine. Because there may be a variation, in a greater latitude from a government, that is established on a Divine right, much more from one which is not established upon Jus Divinum: when the government it self hath its authority but from the State, a forbearance from it, by the State, with laws to prevent contention, cannot be Schisme, or any way endanger it; the nature of Schissine (according to the Scriptures) consisting in an open breach of Christian love, and not in every diversity of opinion or practise. Yea, as both others, and we also bave found, the great cause of Schisme, bath been a strict obligation of all to an uniformity, beyond that of the Apostle. That so far as we have attained wee should walke by the same rule, and if any be otherwise minded God will reveale it in his time.

# To the three first Premises.

1. "That what ever forbearance we shall agree upon, we take it for granted upon our Brethrens Preface, that the "same Directory for worship, and the same Confession of Dddd Faith.

26 The Reply of the Diffenting Brethren, to the

"Faith, shall be imposed upon them, in the same manner, as it

"is imposed upon us.

2. "And therfore whosever agrees not in those things, that contain the substance of the service and worship of God in the Directory, according to the Preface; and shall not agree in the Confession of Faith, nor with the Doctrine of the reformed Churches, contained in their confessions and writings, as we do, who differ from these Brethren in matters of Discipline, shall not have the benefit of this indulgence.

3. "If any shall practise any thing contrary to the Directo-"ry, or write, publish, or declare any Doctrine contrary to the Confession of Faith, he shall be liable to the same penal-

"ties, that we our selves are for the like offence.

Answer.

In general, we only say, affirmatively: that those who do agree in these things that contain the Substance Service, oworship of God in the Directory according to the Preface; and in the confession of faith with Reformed Churches in the Doctrine contained in their confessions and writings (as we and our Brethern do, who differ from us in matter of Church-government) may lawfully be tollerated according to the word of God in such things as we desire: But we meddle not with the Negative; or Impositions; or to set the bounds and limits of forbearance unto all tender consciences. Yea, before, we brought in this Paper, we not knowing but that the honorable Houses might intend a consideration of the generall Rules how sarre tender consciences might be forborn according to the word of God, and as might stand with the peace of

this Kingdome, Professed that we presumed not to limit it to our judgements, nor would bring in any other Report than about the generall Rules of Toleration, unlesse the honorable Committee did determine and limit us, which accordingly was done; It being also declared, that they were sure, that we were intended and the matters of difference in point of Churchgovernment betweene us and our Brethren in the Assembly: yet we, to mipe off such aspersions, prejudices, and suspicions as were upon us, and to make a full and candid Declaration of our judgements and agreements in point of Doctrine and the substance of Worship, did adde that Preface: which now having done, by these interpretations which our Brethren prefent, we should not onely take on us, to call upon the Parliament, to exclude other tender consciences from this forbearance and to impose uponthem; but make Impositions of Directory and Confessions of Faith in the latitude of the Body of Divinity, and not in fundamentals only; and that not only upon the Ministers but upon all the people of this Kingdome; and that as a qualification for receiving Sacraments: Our Brethrens Principles may be larger, for power in Ecclestastical Assemblies to determine and impose circumstantial orders in worship, as well as in the substance, and therefore for us to joyn with our Brethren to have all those things imposed on us, which they can beare, seems hard tous.

Dddd 2

Which

## 28 The Reply of the Diffenting Brethren, to the

"Which things being premised, ( say our Brethren) we have found it needful and most consonant to the businesse, to take first into consideration, the third Proposition of our Bretherns particular desires under the Head of Presbytery, unto which all the rest have so necessary a relation, which they have offered to this Honourable Committee.

#### Concerning which we humbly conceive.

I. "That this desire of our Brethren is not to be granted to them interminis, for the reasons which we herewithall

"humbly offer.

""Because it holds out a plaine and totall seperation from the Rule, as if, in nothing, it were to be complyed with; nor our Churches to be communicated within an thing, which should argue Church-Communion; more could not be said or done against salse Churches.

# To this first Reason. Answ.

A desire to have liberty for multitudes, that cannot out of a tendernesse of conscience partake as members in your Churches, to gather into congregations to enjoy the ordinances; not onely professing your Churches to be true Churches, yea not daring to judge them for that, for which they are in respect of their owne consciences enforced to, namely, to preserve themselves from sin against their consciences to remove from that communion with them; and though gathering into other congregations for the purer enjoyment (as to their consciences) of all ordinances, yet still maintaining

taining communion with them as Churches, (as is expressed in the third Paragraph) is far from separation, much lesse a plain and totall separation. The Asfembly having in what they have given up unto the honorable Honses said thus, Nor is it lawfull for any member of a Parochiall congregation, if the Ordinances be there administred in purity, to go and feek them elsewhere ordinarily, so as in case the Lords Supper be not in purity administred, a removall is allowed ordinarily. And this is not setting up Churches against Churches, but neighbour sister Churches of a differing judgement: If the purest Churches in the world (unto our judgement in all other respects,) should impose as a condition of receiving the Sacrament of the Lords Supper any one thing that such tender consciences cannot joyne in (as suppose kneeling in the act of receiving, which was the case of Scotland and England) if they remove from these Churches, and have liberty from a State to gather into other Churches to injoy this and other Ordinances; here is no separation.

2. A plaine and totall separation from the rule is not in such Churches, unlesse they wholly in all things differ, by setting up altogether differing rules of constitution worship and government: Now in the Churches we desire we shall practice the most of the same things; and these the most substantiall which are found in the Rule it selfe: The same Ordinances of

Dddd 3

worship

29 The Reply of the Diffenting Brethren, to the worship in the Directory; the same Officers, Pastors, Teachers, Ruling Elders; of the same qualification required in the Rule: the same qualification of menibersthe Assembly its selfe holds forth to have beene in the Primitive Churches, viz. visible Saints, that being of age do professe faith in Christ, and obedience unto Christ, according to the Rules of Faith and life taught by Christ and his Apostles: and these officers to joyne into one Eldership in all acts of government of the Church: Holding also the same cenfures, namely, of Admonition, and Excommunication and Absolution and receiving in upon repen. tance; And who, wherein they differ from the Rule will be accountable of all their wayes and tenets un. to those, whom the State shall be pleased to appoint.

3. Holding and retaining communion with neighbour Churches in Baptizing our children (as occasion may fall out) of absence of our Ministers) in their Churches, and by occasionall receiving the Lords Supper in their Churches, and receiving such members of theirs, as are above mentioned, unto communion with us also occasionally: Also our Ministers to preach in their Congregations, and receive theirs also to preach in ours, as Ministers of the Gospel, as mutually there shall be a call from each other: And when we have any Cases difficult and too hard for our selves, electively to advise with the Elders of their

And,

their Churches: And in case of controversie not to refuse to call them in, for the composing of it. Further, in case of the choyce of Elders, to seek the approbation and right-hand of fellowship from godly Ministers of their Churches together with our owne: And when an Ordination fals out among us, to desire the presence and approbation of their Elders with our owne: And in case any of our Churches miscarry through Mal-administration or negleEt of censures, to be willing, upon scandall taken by their Churches to give an account, as to fifter Churches offended: And to esteeme and account (as we do) a sentence of Noncommunion by them, as Churches, against us, upon such scandals wherein they are not satisfied, an heavie and fad punishment, and to be looked at as a meanes to bumble us, and an Ordinance of God to reduce us. All this is more than AS IF IN NOTHING THEY WERE TO BE COMPLYED WITH, NOR THEIR CHURCH-ES TO BE COMMUNICATED WITH, IN ANY THING WHICH SHOULD ARGUE CHURCH COMMUNION, More is said and done by these that account them false Churches.

To the second Reason.

<sup>2. &</sup>quot;It plainly holds out the lawfulnesse of gathering "Churches out of true Churches, yea out of such true "Churches which are indeavouring surther to reform "according to the word of God: whereof we are "assured there is not the least hint of an example in all "the Book of God.

#### We answer.

That, this Reason is founded upon this supposition, that nothing ought to be tolerated which is unlawfull in the judgement of those who are to tolerate: and if so, then by the like reason no State, no Assembly, no Presbytery is to tolerate any practice or opinion which they account to be in the least erronious.

- 2. The way we are to go, is not to dispute what is unlawfull or lawfull in it selfe, because we are upon the point of forbearance, in what is thought unlawfull.
- 3. For that addition ["out of such true Churches" which are endeavouring to reforme] we say, The Reformation which the Assembly hath ultimately pitcht upon, satisfies not our consciences, as our Brethren know.

4. For that addition ["that there is no hint of ex"ample in all the book of God for gathering Churches
out of Churches] we shall onely, at this time humbly
present the nature of the thing or CASE it selfe, as it
lies in our consciences and as in the Assembly we
also stated it.

The case is this, A multitude of beleevers after all means used to obtaine light, to satisfie their consciences in what to them is sin in partaking of the Ordinances as members of the Churches they live

or havelived in, by which, so long as they continue in these Churches, they shall be debarred from these ordinances, though it be all their dayes; and although the opinion bee judged an errour by those Churches they live in, yet of no higher nature then those errours, for which they are not to be suspended from any ordinance, by censure; or cast out of the Church; and in all other things are fuch in their opinions and practifes, as are meet partakers of Comunion with Christ in all ordinances, which as their right, as members of his mystical body, he hath give to them as to their brethren. In this case, there is no obligation laid by Christ either on the persons themselves, for ever to continue in those Churches; or on the Churches they live in, to withhold them from removing, to other Churches, free of that, which would defile their consciences; or, when there are no such Churches in the places they live in To GATHER INTO CHURCHES, whereir they may injoy all ordinances without sin. This affertion, as thus stated, we are ready to debate, when this Honourable Committee shall think fit.

#### To the third Reason.

3. "In granting this, the Parliament should grant liberty to destroy and pull downe what themselves are
endeavouring to set up.

Answ.

An exception doth not make void a rule: especially

E e e e such

The Reply of the Diffenting Brethren, to the such a one, as is not founded on a Jus Divinum, and where it is, in the power of those, who make the rule to grant a forbearance from it. The reformed Churches grant a forbearance; and yet their generall rule stands. And we in our DESIRES, do submit to this Honourable Committee, to find out such wayes as may hest stand with the peace of the Kingdome:

#### To the fourth Reason.

4. "The indulgence they seek is a greater priviledge "then they shall enjoy who shall be under the Rule, "as may appeare in severall particulars. I. Such as own the Rule, must live in the same Parish with the other members of their Church: These may live any where, and be of any Church they please, yea though a "Church of their own way, were in the place where "they live. 2. If such as live under the rule would better themselvs in living under the Pastoral charge of another Minister, they must remove their dwelling; "These need not.

#### Answ:

The Priviledge of those Ministers who submit to the Rule is to be capable of all Ecclesiastical preferments, which we are not. They find no need of indulgence to their consciences as touching the rule established, which we do; possibly their consciences may be scrupled in the same or other things hereaster, and they have the priviledge of the same addresses for relief, we have.

And as for the two particulars therein expressed,

we say first, it is a priviledge, and much to be desired to dwell neer together, and we also shall indeavour it as much as may be for mutuall edification. Secondly it is the right of every man (we humbly conceive) to choose his own Minister, whereas the parishes and their bounds by dwellings, are but of Civill right: provided the State be pleased, to take some order that it may be known, whether every man doth resort.

# To the fifth Reason.

5. This would give countenance to a perpetual Schisme, and division in the Church, still drawing away some from the Churches under the Rule, which also would breed many irritations between the parties going away, and those whom they leave; And again between the Church that should be for saken, and that to which they should go.

#### We answer.

What hurt the abuse of words, and among others this of Schisme hath done in the Churches, our Brethren know, and we all have felt; wherefore seeing as yet the Assembly hath not debated, nor the State determined, what Schisme is, we desire our Brethren that in the seeking to countenance that way, which they think is right, they would not seek to cast an odium, upon their Brethren, who differ from them, and yet together with them, desire (in faithfulnesse) to know Eeee 2

The Reply of the Dissenting Brethren, to the and obey the mind of Christ, by fastning such a

name upon them, or their way.

2. What we desire forbearance in, will countenance only this; When men who give good testimony of their Godlmesse and Peaceablenesse, after all means used in faithfulnesse to know the mind of Christ, they yet cannot without sin, to them, enjoy all the ordinances of Christ, and partake in all the duties of worship, as members of that Congregation, where there dwelling is, they, therefore in humility and meeknesses desire, they may not live without ordinances; but for the injoyment of them for their edification in their spirituall good may joyn in another congregation; yet so, as not condemning those Churches they join not with, as false, but stil preserving all Christian communion with the Saints of the Same body of Christ, (Of the Church-catholick) and joyne with them, in all duties of worship, that belong to particular Churches, so far as they are able. If this be called Schisme, or countenance of Schisme, it is more then yet we have learned, from the Scriptures, or any approved Authors.

3. And as for that irritation our Brethren speak of: as we humbly conceive, it will be according to the temper of mens hearts. If such a practice meets with men, whose hearts are gracious, it will only irritate them to search further into the mind of Christ, and to walke before their Brethren with more exactnesse, and

their brethren who differ from them; and such irritation there is no great cause that either we, or our brethren should make complaints of. If this liberty meet with corruption, it is like enough there may accidentally be an irritation to sin, but the way then to oppose such corruption, is by instruction, prayer, walking convincingly before them: and if they grow turbulent, to call in the help of the Civil-Magistrate; but not to give that respect to their corruptions, as to deny to men, who give undeniable testimony of their Godlinesse, that use of the ordinances of Christ, that they may with the peace of their consciences enjoy.

## . To the fixth Reason.

6. "This would introduce all manner of confusion, in fami"lyes, where the Members were of Severall Churches;
"and exceedingly, if not altogether hinder the mutuall
"edification, that might be afforded and received a"mongst them. And specially in great Familyes, it
"would be impossible for the Governours, to have a
"fure account of all their familyes attending upon the
"Ordinances, when twenty of them may possibly be of
"twenty severall Churches; and much lesse take account
"of their profiting by the Ordinances.

Answer.

I. First in generall, our judgements do thus far agree with yours, that except upon very waighty Eeee 3 consiThe Reply of the Dissenting Brethren, to the considerations, husband and wife, masters and servants, should partake together in the same Ministry.

II. Secondly, If it should happen to be other-

wise:

1. "All manner of confusion would not here-"by be introduced into families: For can our Bre. thren think, that per sons agreeing in all the fundamentals of their faith, and in their judgment and practice joyning in al the same duties of piety in the family; and also agreeing in the same duties of publick worship, for the substance, though not living under the same individual Ministry, yet unlesse they do agree also in an uniformity, both publike and private, they must needs run into all manner of confusion? bath either nature, or the Gospel put such a necessity upon uniformity, in lesser things, to keep families from confusion? If this were the Gospel, then except it prevail upon the opinion of those whom it converts to such an uniformity (which it seldome doth) it must by this principle, of necessity, subvert humane society, by bringing confusion into families, which we conceive to be a great derogation to the Gospel.

2. "Neither would it exceedingly, much leffe al-"together, hinder the mutuall edification, that

might be afforded and received amongst them.

For first, although persons of the same family, not living under the same Ministry, may in some

Some respect of family duties, not so fully edifie, as otherwise; yet in a great measure, they may: and if there be a zeal, and good conscience in any of the family, to be helpful in good conference, & c. It is no such great hinderance to heare in severall places, or severall Preachers; As Schollars reading feverall Books, and then conferring. Many god Christians have for edification purposely practiced it; and it hath some advantages for edification, which the other way hath not.

Secondly, that further degree of edification, which comes to the persons in a family, by going all to the same Ministry, amounts not to that proportion, as to countervaile the want of enjoying the publick ordinances for ever; which compared with family duties, simply considered, have had the preeminence, both in respect to Gods Glory, and the edification of Souls, in all mens concessions; which cannot be enjoyed by many that yet are truly consciencious, except the liberty petitionedbe granted.

III. Thirdly, "For the account, Governours, in "great families, are to take of all in their families attending upon the ordinances, and of their proattending upon the ordinances, and of their pro-"fiting thereby: We answer, the Churches we desire, being constant and fixed, it is no more impossible, then it was for a Godly Tutor in the University to take

40 The Reply of the Dissenting Brethren, to the account of his Pupils, having liberty to go to severall Churches. And,

IIII. Fourthly, "Whereas it is heightned, that "twenty of one family may possibly be of twenty "feverall Churches, we suppose if the State be pleased to grant us the liberty we petition for, that they in their wisedome ( to which we have referred our (elves) will take into consideration, the limitting such congregations to a certain number; and then there may not be twenty Churches, in any city or Town, to di-

vide themselves into.

But the truth is, those that thus plead against this permission (which we desire) as insufferable, must certainly suppose that men are to be tyed, throughout this Kingdome, to their own parish Churches, where they live, both Masters and servants, and that not only for facraments, but for constant hearing: which how burdensome it was in former times, the godly people are very sensible of; and now in the time of Reformation, it finds many Ministers who cannot be cast out, by order of Law, though bad and unprofitable, as appears by the leaving them out of the Classes; and shall the people be tyed to live under them, as their Minister, who are not worthy to joyn in Government, with your felves? and for time to come, as places are void, they must be supplyed by the choice of others for them, or by themselves if by themselves, all parishes are not reformed, as concerning the

people

people, and whereas the major part being generally the worst, the Ministers chosen by them, will be such as the godly cannot live under their Ministry: If by others, those that are the chusers, may also be such as they cannot be denyed by law, their right in choosing, and so also imprositable Ministers, may be put upon the godly people, And if they be not tyed to their parishes, the weight of this reason, and the inconveniences presented, will fall more heavy upon the nucmrous multitude of parishes in city and countrey.

For the Rules towards an Expedient, and the Preface thereunto. Numb. II. & III. We humbly conceive our Brethren have not made a compleat report in that point of what they inintend (as was intimated,) and therefore that this Honourable Committee doth not expect that we should speak any thing to it, till that part of their Australia.

their Answer be perfected.

Let the Reader take notice, that an Answer to the second part of the former Answer of the sub-Committee of Divines, was afterwards given in to the Honourable Committee, by their command. And comes in printed after the Rejoynder (that next followes) made by the sub-Committee of Divines to this Answer of the Dissenting Brethren, in that Order it was given in to the Honorable Committee.

After.

After some debate upon the cautions premised, in the paper of Sub-committee, presented Decemb. 15. and drawn out of the Brethrens Presace, it was resolved by the Honourable-Committee.

Resolved that both the affirmative and negative of the second caution, shall be put unto the Question; and accor-

dingly it was.

Resolved upon the Question, that they which agree in the substance of the worthip of God in the Directory, according to the Presace, and agree in the Consession of Faith, and with the doctrine of the Resormed Churches, contained in their consessions and writings, as we do, who differ from those brethren in matters of Discipline, shall have the bene-

fit of this indulgence.

Resolved upon the Question, that such as agree not in those things which contain the substance of the worship of God in the Directory, according to the Preface; and shall not agree in the Confession of Faith, nor with the Doctrine of the Resormed Churches, contained in their confessions and writings, as we do, who differ from these Brethren in matters of Discipline, shall not have the benefit of this Indulgence.

Resolved upon the Qustion, that the Brethrens Paper this day brought in shall be referred to the Sub-committee to consider of it, and they are further to go on with the work begun; and the Brethren to go on with their answer to the

former Paper of the Sub-committee.

Jan. 23.1645. The Committee met again, and the sub-committee presented a Reply to the Answer of the Dissenting Brethren, brought in Decemb. 23.1645, which is as followeth.

A



# AReply to An Answer brought in to this

Honourable Committee, (Decem. 23.1645.)
unto a paper formerly tendred by a Sub-Committee of the Divines of the Assembly.

To their Preface.

Ur Reverend Brethren being charged with an unwillingnesse to pursue the method prescribed in the Order of the Honourable Houses, which was in the first place to endeavour an Accommodation, do declare. I. That in a Sub-committee twelve moneths since, they had earnestly endeavoured such an Accommodation, and made a great progresse therein. 2: That the Rule being now resolved on, unto which they had entred their dissent, it is by that meanes become impossible for them to endeavour an Accommodation; which implyeth an agreement in one common Rule; since they doe not presume to seeke a new Rule to be made.

To which we say, That although our Brethren had entred their dissent against some particulars of the Rule established (for we know not that any dissent was ever entred against the whole,) yet the Honourable Houses being pleafed in their Order to prescribe this method of proceeding, and to require the endeavour of an Accommodation, which Order, notwithstanding any such dissent of our Brethren, they have in their wisedome and zeal for the peace of the Church, thought good to renew, we conceive our Brethren (as well as our selves) were obliged first to have endeavoured an obedience to it, before they declare that that

44 The Answer of the Sub-committee of the Divines

is in their judgement impossible to bee done, which the wisdome of the Houses (notwithstanding they were not ignorant of the cause, upon which that pretended impossibility is grounded) have been pleased to require, and therefore we humbly declare, that the only stop of endeavouring an Accommodation is in our Brethren themselves, and not in the Honourable Houses, or in us.

And for the progresse which they say, was formerly made in a Sub-Committee towards an Accommodation, that should the more have encouraged them at this time in the same endeavor. But indeed we find by the acts of that

Treaty,

probability of any Accommodation with our Brethren, because they could not perceive any willingnesse in them totake any such congregations, as ours, which some of them

have fince that time professed they cannot do.

2. That they did not yeild any thing towards any union with us, but every where put in exceptions to the Proposals tending thereunto. So that in that Accommodation they did in a manner fully demand according to their principles, the same things by way of exception, which they now crave by way of Toleration.

3. In that Treaty, they defired the liberty of gathering Churches, yet then seemed to doubt whether this Honourable Committee would not judge it a thing prejudiciall to the state. But now they wholly insist upon it, only referring the manner how it may stand with the publick peace to the

consideration of this Honourable Committee,

They say that in the nature of the thing, without supposition of the Rule, as now it is established, they and we agree in common principles enough, and sufficient to have preserved the Churches and Saints in these Kingdomes in peace. Whereunto we answer. 1. If so, that again should have encouraged them to proceed in the Treaty of Accommodation. modation. 2. We conceive those common principles are those only which concern the power of congregations, which they misapply to an independency, and if the peace of the Churches must have been preserved by our making the same use of those Principles, it is evident it must have been procured not by an Accommodation between us, but by our going over to our Brethren, and acquiescing in their way.

3. What ever agreement may be in other things, there is none in that which is fundamentall to the very constitution of Churches, namely, the qualification of members, wherein their principles are so farre from permitting them to joyne withus, and so to lay any grounds of peace, that indeed they lead them to draw members continually from us unto separation.

4. They make no mention of any mutuall bond to preferve Churches in Truth and Godlinesse for mutuall edisication, wherein we think their way is much desective. Nor lastly, do they tell us how others, whom they look not on as Saints, shall be dealt withall, and brought in, they having in their way no Pastorall relation unto any such: and we doubt not but our way will continue to be, as it hath been essectuall to that purpose, if we be not disturbed in it

by our brethrens opposition.

They say, the Honourable Houses not having seene their differences and reasons against subordination of Assemblies, when they renewed this order, might thinke that they might accommodate with the Rule which they have set forth. To which we answer. I. That the Honourable Houses cannot be ignorant of their judgement in this point, it appearing evidently in their dissentand reasons against Classicall Presbyteries, and in their disclaiming of Synods to have power of Government. 2. Let our brethren joyn with us in the rest, and we doubt not to find out some expedient to ease them in this particular.

They proceed, neither will such a forbearance as we seeke, Fiff 2 endan-

endanger Schisme, because there may be a variation in a greater latitude, from a Government that is established on a Divine Right, much more from one which is not established on a sus Divinum, when the Government it selfe hath its authority but from the State, a forbearance from it by the State, which Lawes to prevent contentions, cannot be Schifme, or any way endanger it: the nature of Schisme, according to the Scriptures, confisting in an open breach of Christian love, and not in every diversity of opinion or practice; yea as both others, and we also have found the great cause of Schisme, hatio beene a strict obligation of all to an uniformity, beyond that of the Apostle, that so farre as we have attained, we Should walk by the same rule; and if any be otherwise minded, God will reveale it in his time.

How farre this forbearance may endanger a Schisme, comes after to be confidered, nor are we satisfied what greater variation may be without Schisme, then to confesse Churches to be true, and yet to require separated Churches from them of another constitution. Their observation, that forbearance when a Government hath its authority from the State only, cannot be schisme, doth not lay an aspersion on the Rule, as if it were meerly and totally humane, and had nothing of the will of God in it; but doth clearly open a wide gap for as many as either by them in their way, or by any others in other wayes can be perswaded of a divine Right elsewhere, to shake off their obedience and submission unto it. Nor can laws to prevent contentions, hinder fuch a dangerous consequence as this, for who will not hold himself bound, upon such premises, to contend earnestly for the way of God, against meer humane constitution, who will not rather lay hold on the Priviledge of a Toleration, to be amongst these of the godly party, as they call themselves, and in the way of Christ, as they speak, then to continne under such a Rule, and in such a Communion for Government as is charged to be meerly of an humane originall?

of the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Brethren.

nall? Such a Toleration to be provided before-hand, not only for persons already separated from us, but for as many as art and industry for all time to come, can be able to gain unto the same perswasion, from the obedience of the Rule established, was we beleeve, never yet demanded of the Christian Magistrate by any in Churches confessed by themselves to be true; especially considering that those who demand it, have bound themselves by Covenant to indeavour to bring all the Churches of God in these Kingdomes to the neerest uniformity and conjunction, and to extirpate Schisme. And albeit this Schisme consists not in every diversity of opinion or practise, but in an open breach of Chris stian love, yet we see not how our brethren can acquit themselves even by this Rule, when they openly professe a necessity recede from our Churches as members, while yet they acknowledge them to be true Churches of Christ. Thus to depart from true Churches, is not to hold Communion with them, as such, but rather by departing to declare them not to be such. Surely at best we may say of this course as the Philosopher did of the Milesians, Milesia quidenz non sunt insepientes, ea tamen agunt que insepientes.

And although no Uniformity were necessary against Schisme, yet to our Brethren, by vertue of their Covenant, it is aliquous que necessary, so farre as the Apostle directs, which is, whereunto we have attained to walk by the same Rule. Therefore agreeing with us in Worship and Doctrine, and acknowledging our Churches, Ordinances and Ministers to be true, so true, as that they can occasionally joyne with us in allacts of Worship, we conceive they ought in these things to act in joynt communion with us by one common Rule, and not by different Rules, and in separated Congregations. And certainly Gods way for revealing truth to such as are otherwise minded, is not by setting men at a distance from one another, but by keeping them in the unity of the spirit, to walke together peaceably and regu-

148 The Answer of the Sub.committee of the Divines
larly inthat whereunto they have attained, and more is not defired of our Reverend Brethren.

#### To their Answer to the three first Premises.

We need not make any large Reply to their Answer to our three Premises. The first they do not deny, but acknowledge in their Explanations. The second is Voted in this Honourable Committee. And the third we doubt not but the Honourable Houses will adde. Their reasons moving them to decline the negative, and impositions, and the setting bounds of sorbearance to all tender consciences, wee will therefore examine.

But when our Brethren alleadge, that to wipe off aspersions, prejudices, and suspicions which were upon them, and to make a full and candid Declaration of their agreements in point of Doctrine and Substance of Worship, they added the Preface: If they meane the agreement of their owne persons (who brought in that Paper) in these things, we know not any necessity of so doing, they not having been ever charged with disagreements of that nature: and besides it would have no relation to the desires of our Brethren which are not for their own persons alone, but for all others of their judgement in the matters of difference betweene them and us; but if they meane all others of that judgement, we conceive it a difficult thing to affirme that all such do agree in Worship and Doctrine with the Reformed Churches, as we and our Brethren do. And therefore except our interpretation of it, which they dislike, be admitted, we cannot look on it otherwise then as a Cipher before a Number, which is of no fignification at all.

In the next place our Brethren misinterpret our intentions, when they say, we make these impositions upon the people as a qualification of receiving Sacraments, for we desire to have no more imposed on our people, then they in that case

do

do on theirs, namely that they appeare to us to be Orthodox.

Lastly, We wonder at our Brethrens conclusion of this point touching the largeness of our principles for power in Ecclesiastical Assemblies to determine and impose circumstantial matters, seeing our proposition interminis doth mention nothing but agreement in substance, according to their own words; therefore for them to refuse to joyn with us in setling those things which they declare they agree in, seemeth hard unto us, and doth too much intimate an unwilling nesse to come to that neernes of conjunction, which may settle us in one body without offence.

For the Brethrens answer to our first reason against their desire of Toleration as it is by them expressed, we shall pre-

mise these few observations to our Reply.

1. They seem to grant that a plain & totall separation from the rule, or our Churches, as no true Churches, is not to be indul-

ged, which strengtheneth our reason.

2. They suppose some things in our Congregations will be so far offensive to Multitudes who are of tender Consciences, that they will not dare to pertake as Members therein. This is a hard judgment to entertaine against Churches, which are under the tye of a Solemn Covenant, endeavouring a reformation according to Gods word. We desire the particular matters of offence may be expressed, professing our earnest endeavor, so much as in us lies, to remove whatever may hinder comfortable Communion, that there may be no just occasion of separation.

3. We desire to know whether every persons bare alleaging tenderness of Conscience shall be sufficient to warrant his deserting of our Congregations; or if not, what shall be the rule of discerning, or who the judges in such a

case?

4. We conceive that our Brethrens ground of separation from one Church, & gathering others, to this end that men

Gggg

may be preserved from sinning against their Consciences & for the purer enjoyments of ordinances as to their Consciences, may, to men of other judgments be a ground to crave toleration for separating from Churches which are constituted in all things according to Gods word in the sense of our Brethren, and gathering impure and corrupt Churches out of them; because upon the dictate of an erring Conscience (whereby Multitudes may be infected) men may really disallow Churches which are pure, in some particulars. wherein they are pure, and fet up others which are more sutable to their own erring Conscience; and consequently, as many severall sorts of Churches may be set up in a State, as the severall dictates of erroneous Consciences may suggest: If our brethren conceive this ought not to be done in different cases from theirs, they must give us leave to judge that neither in theirs it ought to be done.

5. Whereas they give a character of those whom they desire indulgence for, to be such as acknowledge our Churches to be true Churches, as dare not judge them in that for which the, leave them; and such as maintaine Communion with those Churches, as Churches, which they leave, in severall particulars expressed in their third paragraph, we desire it may be declared, that none other shall have the benefit of that indulgence which shall be granted, then they who are thus

minded.

In this answer our Brethren say, A desire to have liberty for Multitudes who cannot out of tenderness of conscience partake as Members in your Churches, to gather into Congregations to enjoy the ordinances, not onely professing your Churches to be true Churches, yea not daring to judge them for that for which they are in respect of their own consciences enforced to, namely to preserve themselves from sin against their consciences, to remove from that communion with them; and though gathering into other Congregations for the pure enjoyment (as to their consciences) of all ordinances, yet still maintaining communion with them as Churches.

Churches, as is expressed in the third paragraph, is far from sepa-

ration, much lesse a plaine and totall separation.

We answer not to the English, (for who ever called defire of Liberty, a Separation?) But to the matter, 1. We know not whom they meane by Multitudes; If Congregations, we would gladly know where they are, and how they may be known and distinguished, that we may be able to judge whether this character do agree unto them, or whether they will owne that, which our Brethren here affirme of them: (For it is dubious unto us, whether there be Multitudes of fuch who are thus minded ) If single persons, we have already expressed our sense how farre they may be indulged, appearing to be such as are here described. 2. We much doubt whether such tenderness of Conscience as ariseth out of an opinion Cui potest subesse falsum, when the Conscience is so tender, as that it may be withall an erring Conscience, can be a sufficient ground to justifie such a materiali separation as our Brethren plead for; For, though it may binde to forbeare or suspend the act of Communion in that particular wherein Men conceive they cannot hold Communion without sin, (nothing being to be done contrary unto Conscience;) yet it doth not binde to follow such a politive prescript as possibly may be divers from the will and counsell of God, of which kinde we conceive this of gathering separated Churches out of other true Churches to be one.

They add an Assertion of the Assembly, in these words, nor is it lawfull for any Member of a Parochiall Congregation, if the ordinances be there administred in purity, to go and seek them elsewhere ordinarily; and thence inferre, in case the Lords Supper be not in purity administred, a removeall is allowed ordinarily.

We answer 1. It was never the meaning of the Assembly to leave the judgement of pure or impure ordinances in this case, unto the alone discretion of a particular person, but

Gggg 2

before

before any leave their Parochiall Congregation, upon this pretence ordinarily, he ought to declare the cause of his grievance, that if it may be his removall may be prevented, except he think sit to change his dwelling, in which case his removall is without offence. 2. It is one thing to remove to a Congregation which is under the same rule, another to a Congregation of a different constitution from the rule; in the former case a man retaines his membership, though for some defects he seek elswhere, til those defects be by the care of the officers of the Church cured: in the latter he renounceth his membership upon difference of judgement touching the very constitution of the Churches from and unto which he removes.

It followes, If the purest Churches in the world unto our judgment in all other respects, should impose as a condition of receiving the Sacrament of the Lords Supper any one thing that such tender consciences cannot joyn in (as suppose kneeling in the act of receiving, which was the case of Scotland and England) if they remove from these Churches and have liberty from a state to gather into other Churches, to injoy this and other ordinances, here

is no separation.

Weanswer 1. If a Church require that which is evill of any Member, he must forbeare to do it, yet without separation, and waite on Gods providence in the dispensation of that Church, till all remedies have been tried. 2. He that is in this kinde oppressed, may be releived by Appeale, or change of dwelling. 3. They who thought kneeling in the act of Communion to be unlawfu'l, either in England or Scotland, did not separate or renounce Membership, but did some of them with zeal & learning defend our Churches against those of the separation. 4. Those words [If they have liberty from the State to gather into other Churches ] seeme to imply that otherwise that liberty may not be taken; else we know not of what use they are; but we thinkeour Brethren will not abide by that sense, having now for some years without leave from the State gathered themselves into separated rated Churches, even then when the State have been and still are labouring to reforme the Church according to Gods word. 5. The nature of separation is not to be measured by civill acts of State, but by the word of God; what notion our Brethren have of it we know not, but surely to leave all ordinary communion in any Church with dislike, when opposition or offence offers it selfe, is to separate from such a Church in the Scripture sense; such separation was not in being in the Apostles time, unlesse it were used by false teachers; all who professed Christianity held communion together as in one Church, notwithstanding differences of judgment, or corruptions in practice.

In their second paragraph they say, A plain and totall separation from the rule is not in such Churches, unless they wholly in all things differ, by setting up altogether differing rules of con-

stitution, worship and government.

Of this affertion we expect some proofe; we read not the like in any Author ancient or modern. Under this pretence, Novatians, Donatists, all that ever were thought to separate might shelter themselves; the most rigide Separatists, who themselves boast of their separation, hold the same rule of worship and government for substance, with our Brethren: and consequently by this rule they must boast no longer of their separation, which is become by this meanes none, or no plaine and totall one.

In the next words they say so much of their agreement with us, that we cannot conceive any sufficient ground lest for their separation from us. We shall practise say they most of the same things, and those the most substantiall; we shall have the same ordinances of worship, as in the Directory, the same officers, and of the same qualification, the same qualification of Mem-

bers which the Assembly holds forth.

But here they leave out Infants, which the Assembly did expresse, and amongst censures, suspension, in which they agree not amongst themselves; But we are glad to hear them

Gggg 3

professe

professe to agree with us in practice of most of the same things, and those the most substantiall in the rule it selse; and we are the more sorry to have heard them profess that the nature of the business, & the whole frame and bulk of the rule is such, as that they are not able to endeavour an accommodation with it, but are necessitated to desire a Toleration, for gathering Congregations under another rule of their own, never yet by them manifested to us.

We defire our Brethren to consider, if every small and circumstantial difference amongst those who agree in most things, and those most substantiall, shall be a sufficient ground to gather Churches out of Churches into a separate and different communion, how the Church of God shal ever be kept free from rents and divisions, and how the peace thereof is

possible to be preserved?

To these agreements they add, That wherein they differ from the rule, they will be accomptable of all their wayes and tenets unto those whom the State shall be pleased to ap-

point.

We answer 1. That in this also we agree with them, for all things done by our Assemblies; for as we dare not claime an intire, absolute, independent power within our selves free from Classes and Synods, so neither dare we exempt our Classes and Synods from the power and inspection of the State. 2. Albeit our Brethren insinuate much respect and submission to the State, yet we find not, that they petitioned the State, or obtained leave from them to practice their own Church-way, but did it of themselves, and that by way of anticipation to the State, when it had declared a resolution to reforme the Church according to Gods word; and wee beleeve they would continue as they have begun, though the State should forbid them. 3. what if the State should at any time be pleased to appoint Synods and Classes to take an accompt of our Brethrens wayes andtenets, would they herein acquiesce? But to proceed,

In

In their third Paragraph they thew what communion they will hold with neithbour Churches. Holding and retaining (say they) communion with the neighbour Churches in baptizing our children, as occasion may fall out of absence of our Ministers in their Churches : and by occasionall receiving the Lords Supper in their Churches, and receiving such members of theirs, as are above mentioned, into communion with us also occasionally. Also our Ministers to preach in their congregations, and receive theirs also to preach in ours as Ministers of the Gospel; as mutually there shall be a call from each other: and when we have any cases difficult and too hard for our selves, electively to advise with the Elders of their Churches: and in case of controversie, not to refuse to call them in for the composing of it. Further in case of the choise of Elders, to seeke the approbation, and right-hand of fellowship from godly Ministers of their Churches together with our own. And when anordination fals out amongst us, to desire the presence and approbation of their Elders with our own. And in case any of our Churches miscarry through mal-administration or neglect of censures, to be willing upon scandall taken by their Churches to give an account as to lifter Churches offended: and to esteeme and account (as we do) a sentence of non-communion by them as Churches, against us, upon such scandals wherein they are not satisfied, an heavy and sad punishment, and to be looked on as a meanes to humble us, and an Ordinance of God to reduce us. All this is more then as if in nothing they were to be complyed with, northeir Churches to be communicated with in any thing which should argue Church communion. More is said; and done. by those that account them false Churches.

To these things we answer, first in generall. 1. That in most of these particulars they have de salo estranged themselves from us hitherto, and therefore we have reason to question in what sense they account our Ministers and Churches true. 2. If they may occasionally exercise these acts of communion with us once, or a second, or third time,

with-

without sinne, we know no reason why it may not be ordinary, without sinne too, and then separation and Church gathering would have been needlesse. To seperate from those Churches ordinarily and visibly, with whom occasionally you may joyne without finne, seemeth to be a most unjust separation. 3. All the communion here spoken of, isbut ad placitum; we desire to know whether our brethren will be bound to these particulars as conditions of the indulgence to be granted, as,

1. That no Officer be chosen in their Congregations

without the consent of the Churches in that Classis.

2. That they and their members give an account before the Officers in the Classis, who shall, as they see occasion, affemble to require it of them. The separatists at Am-F. Johnston Sterdam received none into communion with them out of the in his in- Dutch, French, and other reformed Churches there inhaquiry and biting, but required them to advertice the Elders first, and Th. white, then the whole body of the Church whereof they were (if they might be suffered) of the corruptions for which they thought to leave them; but our brethren have taken out of our Congregations into theirs, without shewing any cause, and their filence in this particular implyes they intend to do the like for the time to come, though they cannot be ignorant of the great offence our Ministers and people doe take at it.

3. We defire to know whether they will submit the power of Jurisdiction in their particular congregations to the power of Arbitration, which they give to Synods, or will rescind any sentence upon the determination of a

Synod, or at the command of the State.

To the particulars. I. They say they will Baptize their children, and receive the Lords Supper occasionally inour Churches. It then followes, that a Minister is a Minister out of the bounds of his own Congregation, and so to the Church indefinitely; for members of 20 or more severall congrega-

p2g.25.

tions

of the A sembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Brethren. tions may occasionally communicate with one Minister in a distinct congregation from all those; this serves much to strengthen our grounds for the Presbyteriall Government, and to weaken Independency.

2. They can preach in our congregations, and admit us to do the like as Ministers in theirs. No need then of separate

Churches for the exercise of their Ministery.

2. In difficult cases too hard for them selves, they can electively advise with Ethe Iders of our Churches. Ordinarily then they will assume a power to determine controversies and cafes of Conscience within themselves, and not make use of the advice of others but at their own discretion. 2. This intimates another and greater power assumed by particular congregations, namely to call Synods, more or fewer, smaller or greater, when they please themselves, which liberty of what consequence it may prove to the State, we leave it to this honourable Committee to confider.

4. In case of controversie they will not refuse to call our Elders in for composing of it. 1. This is ad libitum, they wil have no arbitrators but whom and when they please. 2. They shall have but a consultative power for counsell, they will still reserve a liberty of after debates; and the finall determination of every controversie must be by a juridicall sentence of their own, as the Bishops who though they allowed of Appeales, yet brough back all to their own

Courts at last.

5. In the choice of Elders, they will feek approbation from godly Ministers of our Churches; but unlesse our Ministers be judged godly by them, they inted to exclude them & herein if they will void their election upon these Ministers dissent, they far fomething: but otherwise it is but a complement to get countenance from neighbour Churches, when it may be had, to their proceedings, and when not to be had, to neglect it.

6. In an Ordinatio they will desire the presence and approbation of our Elders with their own. It would please them to have

have our presence justify and allow their practise: but they will not permit us to concur with them in the act of ordaining: they will not receive Ordination from our Elderships, though they have none of their own: & with them any two Elders, though neither of them be a Minister of the word, make a sufficient Presbytery to this or other purposes. And indeed they look on Ordination but as accidentall to the calling of a Minister, and place the essence of it in the peo-

ples choice and acceptance.

7. In cases of mal-administration, or neglect, when scandall is taken by our Churches, they will give an account to them as to sister Churches. We feare there are many corrupt opinions in the members of their Churches, which they neglect to censure. And we have long professed that we are scandalized at their practice in drawing away the members of our Churches from us, and gathering Churches out of ours. And that boundlesse liberty and toleration which they do too much favour, and some of their own way plead and write for, doth justly offend us. Yet we have not hitherto been so respected, as Churches of God, unto whom offence ought not to be given; we would gladly, to use our brethrens phrase, receive some account of these things.

8. For the sentence of non-communion, we do not well understand it, nor the grounds our of Scripture for it. We know not how a power to inflict by way of sentence, an heavy punishment, by vertue of a divine Ordinance, to humble and reduce, can be severed from alkind of jurisdiction; If our brethren would cleerly state and prove this point, it might haply afford some surred further light towards an Accom-

modation instead of a Toleration.

To the second Reason:

In their Answer to our second Reason they tell us in the first Paragraph, That this reason is founded upon this supposition, that nothing ought to be tolerated which is unlawfull in the judgement of those who are to tolerate. And if so, then by

the

of the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Brethsen. 59
the like reason, no State, Assembly, Preshyters, is to tolerate any
practice or opinion which they account to be in the least erroneous.

We deny this affirmation: our Reason is not founded upon the supposition that nothing unlawfull may be tolerated: but upon the supposition of unlawfulnesse to tolerate the gathering of Churches out of true Churches. And they do not once endeavour to prove either that such gathering, or the tolerating thereof is lawfull.

Next they say, The way we are to go is not to dispute what is unlawfull or lawfull init selfe: because we are upon the

point of forbearance in what is thought unlawfull.

We answer. I. This is not the first time our Brethren have waved the dispute of the lawfulnesse of their Church-gathering; upon severall occasions, it hath been presfed on them in the Assembly, but they have hitherto declined it. 2. We are here to debate the lawfulness of forbearance, and may insist upon any proper medium to that end: for clearing whereof, the lawfulnesse or unlawfulnesse of that point of Church gathering is one of the most necessary. 3. We conceive that to judge aright of the lawfulnes orunlawfulnesse of forbearance, will necessarily lead us to consider the lawfulnesse or unlawfulnesse of the thing in it selfe, which is to be tolerated; there are great degrees of danger or mischief in things unlawfull, some are more inconsistent with piety, truth, or peace in the Church then others, and consequently lesse tolerable in the nature of the thing then others.

In their third Paragraph they say, for that adddition, [Out of such true, Churches as are endeavouring to reforme,] we say, The Reformation which the Assembly hathultimately pitched upon, satisfies not our consciences as our Brethren

know.

We answer. 1. That our brethren had such gathered Churches before any ultimate Resolution of the Assembly Hhhh 2 was

was known, or in being. 2. What the Assembly hath done, in great measure doth satisfy our brethren; why else profess they so great an agreement with the rule in most things, and those most substantials. 2. If our brethren had brought in their modell of Government as was ordered April 4. the Assembly would have embraced any light they should have found therein, and consequently have proceeded unto surther resolutions consonant thereunto. 4. The wisdome of the honcurable houses, may find out more for Reformation then haply the Assembly have advised, or themselves as yet concluded. We have set our selves no bounds but the word of God, and example of the best Reformed Churches, and therefore we are still Reforming, and

feparation is the more inexcufable.

In their fourth Paragraph they thus go on. For that addition [ That there is no bint of example in all the book of God for gathering (hurches out of Churches ] weshall one is at this time humbly present the nature of the thing or case it selfe as it lyes in our consciences, and as in the Assembly we also stated it. The case is this. A multitude of beleevers after all meanes nsed to obtaine light, to satisfie their consciences in what to. them is finin partaking of the Ordinances, as members of the Churches they live or have lived in, by which so long as they continue in those Churches they shall be debarred from these ordinances, though it be all their dayes: and although the opinion be judged an error by those Churches they live in, yet of no higher nature then the se errors for which they are not to be suspended from any Ordinance by censure, or cast out of the Church, and in all other things are such in their opinions and practices, as are meet partakers rof communion with Christ in all Ordinances, which as their right, as members of his misty call body, he hath given to them, as to their brethren. In this case there is no obligation laid by Christ either on the persons themselves for ever to continue in those Churches: or in the Churches they live in, to with-hold them from removing to other Churches, free of that which

of the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Brethren. 61

which would defile their consciences: or when there are no such churches in the places they live in, to gather into Churches wherein they may injoy all Ordinances without sinne. This Assertion as thus stated, we are ready to debate when this Honoura-

ble Committee shall thinke fit.

Answ. We desire it may be noted how they wave the main businesse, whether there be any example in Gods word for gathering Churches out of Churches: we take it for granted, no instance can be given by them, because they produce none. As touching the case which they propound, we are ready to joyn in the debate, when it is stated by mutuall agreement. At present we offer these things to consideration.

1. Whether it doth not imply that every one must have a liberty allowed him in the right of his being a member of Christ to gather a Church, or into a Church, wherein he may receive the Sacrament sutably to his own principles, which opens a gap for all Sects to challenge such a liberty as

their due.

2. Whether from hence it doth not follow that an erroneous conscience doth bind a man to follow the positive prescript thereof, when indeed (though he see it nor) the prescript thereof is contrary to the Rule of Gods word. For instance. If a man were of an opinion that the Sacrament ought to be received at night time, and after his ordinary supper, and could not joyn in communion with any Church which should observe another order, whether he were bound upon the prescript of such an erroneous conscience, to separate from all Churches where the Ordinance was in truth rightly administred, and to gather into a Church where he might communicate according to the error of his own judgement.

3. Whether this liberty be not denyed by the Churches of New-England, which our brethren thinke to be the best Reformed, and had an eye unto, in taking the Covenant

Hhhh 3

62 The answer of the Sub-committee of the Divines

(as some of them have professed) and whether we have not as just ground to deny this liberty as they.

## To the third Reason they thus answer.

An exception doth not make void a Rule; especially such an one as is not sounded on a Jus Divinum, and where it is in the pomer of these who make the Rule to grant a forbearance from it. The Reformed Churches grant a forbearance, and yet their generall rule stands, and we in our desires do submit to this Honourable Committee to find out such wayes as may best standwith the peace of

the Kingdome.

We answer, 1. An exception limited and restrained in the extent of it, doth not void the rule in all other cases unto which those limits do not extend; but an exception may be of so great a latitude, as by consequence and virtually it may void the rule; and of that nature we conceive this exemption which our Brethren desire, to be; for it doth actually evacuate it to all such as are for the present of their judgement, and it doth the same potentially unto all such who for the future may be drawn unto the same judgement, or any other way to scruple the established rule in any branch of it. which we have cause to fear, if once tolerated, will be no small number, seeing themselves tell us that Multitudes are of this mind already, before they have had the wing of toleration to protect them; He that leaves open one wide gap in a ground at which any cattell that will may go out, doth make void the use of the hedge, which is other wise round about it, unto that purpose of keeping them in.

2. Whether the rule be founded on a just divinum or no, is not our question, though if we would speake ad hominem, we conceive our Brethrens principles would not allow them to agree in most things, and those the most substantial of the rule, if there were no divine right in their judgement to found the rule in those particulars upon; but we finde our

Brethren

Brethren very willing to insist on and winde in that notion on every occasion; we will not busie our thoughts in conjecturing the reasons of it; but surely it is not in this place of such specialluse as they pretend; for a rule sounded on a just divinum positivum is no more voided by an exception then a rule not sounded on a just divinum.

3. Nor is it our question, whether they who make a rule, may not grant a forbearance: but whether a forbearance may not be of such a latitude as in effect to disannul the rule; if this be our Brethrens meaning, that an exception will not void a rule, when those who make the rule, make the exception likewise, because it may be presumed that the same power will not by an act of savor evacuate a rule of Government, which it selfe hath set up; we are of the same perswasion, which makes us humbly suggest that such a forbearance as is desired, is of this nature, and therefore not to be

granted.

4. We cannot but much question whether any reformed Churches grant such an unlimited toleration as our Brethren defire; that it may be free and lawfull for any Multitudes of men even of their own natives, who are under a rule, to difpute and declare against it, that it is but a rule set up by humane power, and that there is another rule, appointed by a divine law different from it, unto which men ought to fubmit, rather then unto the other, and by such arguments to draw as many as can be possessed with so deep a prejudice from the rule established, into separated Charches, & such separation to beunto as many as please, as well native as forraigners, as lawfull by a toleration, as the rule it selfe is by a constitution, and all this done by the advice of those Churchesthemselves; we thinke our Brethren cannot finde many reformed Churches that tolerate separation at all, nor any one that doth it in so unlimited a manner, and that not by connivence onely, but by a law.

To the fourth reason they thus answer, The priviledge of those

The Answer of the Sub-committee of the Divines

those Ministers who submit to the rule is to be capable of all Ecclesiasticall preferments, which we are not; they find no need of indulging to their consciences as touching the rule established, which wee do; possibly their consciences may be scrupled in the same or other things hereafter, and they have the priviledge of the same addresses for reliefe we have; and as for the two particulars therein expressed, we say first, it is a priviledge, and much to be desired, to dwell neere together, and we also shall endeavour it as much as may be for mutuall ediscation. Secondly, it is the right of every man (we humbly conceive) to choose his own Minister, whereas Parishes and their bounds by dwellings are but of civill right, provided the State be pleased to take some order that it may be knowne whether every man doth resort.

We answer, I. Our Brethren mistake us; we speake of the priviledges of the people; they understand us, as if we meant

Ministers and their adventages.

2. Admit this particular priviledge were true, yet our reason may be good, that in other things their priviledges would be more.

3. We know no Ecclesiasticall preferment but employment and maintenance, and whether our Brethren enjoy not these as well as other Ministers, we leave to be considered.

4. It is possible as our Brethren say, that others may be scrupled in other things hereaster, as they are in these now, and then they have the priviledge of the same addresse for reliefe which now they have; we much doubt this inference, except our Brethren would have any scruple what soever, which may possibly arise in any mens consciences, to be a just ground.

their Members live together as much as may be, will indeed be as much as comes to nothing, considering what they next say, that it is the right of every man to chuse his own Minister, which assertion of theirs we will not dispute, but certainly

fome

of the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Brethren. 65

fome would deny, and it will be like to breed much confufion, and render that, extreme difficult, if not altogether impossible, which they propound as the onely remedy for the Magistrate to take account of the people whither they resort to heare.

But granting this affertion, it doth not take away our reafon; for, suppose it be the peoples right to chose their Minister, then this is the priviledge of those which have the toleration, they shall enjoy their right absolutely, which those who are under the rule cannot do without removing their

dwellings.

To the fift reason they thus answer; What hurt the abuse of words, and amongst others this of Schisme hath done in the Churches, our Brethren know, and we all have felt; wherefore seeing as get the Assembly hath not debated, nor the State determined what Schisme is, we desire our Brethren that in the seeking to countenance that way which they think is right, they would not seek to cast an odium upon their Brethren who differ from them, and get together with them desire in faithfulness to know and oby the minde of Christ, by fastning such a name upon them, or their way.

Whereunto we reply, that had the word Schisme been lest out, the reason would have remained strong, viz. that this would give countenance to a perpetuall division in the Church, still drawing away from the Churches under the rule: and yet to that (as being manifest in it selfe) they offer no answer at all, but fastning on the word Schisme labour to divert the odium thereof, which yet in the original sense thereof differs no more from division, then Greek from La-

tine in expressing the same thing.

That the abuse of words hath done much hurt, we wislingly grant, but that may be, as well by calling evill good, as by calling good evill; So the Papists abuse words, nor only by fastning on the Orthodox the name of Heretiques, but

Iiii .

by assuming to themselves the name of Catholiques; and therefore as we shall be tender in this point towards our Brethren; so we desire them, that by assuming the name of tendernesse of conscience to their dissenting from the rule, or of a Churchway or Churchorder, to their way and godly party, they would not resselt an odium upon us or the Churches under the rule.

And although the Assembly have not debated, nor the State determined what Schisme is, any otherwise then the declaring of what is rectum, is the declaring of that which is obliquim; yet both have covenanted to endeavor the extirption of Schisme, and so are bound to give no countenance

unto any just occasion thereof.

And however the Government which the Assembly bath advised, & the State already in part established, buth had a sufficient load of odium and aspersions cast upon it by some who would thereby gain reputation to their own way in so doing, yet we conceive it both unworthy to feek countenance unto that which we think right, by casting odium on our Brethren, who differ from us, and yet together with us defire in faithfulnes to know and obey the mind of Christ, and that the cause it selfe needs no such artifices to gain countenance to it, which hath appear'd, & we hope thall further appear to agreeable to the word, & warranted by it, that there will be left no just cause of separating from communion with us therein; & our Brethren know that to give countenance to an unjust and causelesse separation from lawfull Church communion, is not farre from giving countenance to a schisme, especially when the grounds upon which this separation is desired, are such, as upon which all other possible Scruples with erring consciences may in-any other cases be subject unto, may clame the priviledge of alike indulgence, & so this toleration being the first; that indeed but lay the foundation, and open the gap, whereat as many divisions in the Church as there may be scruples. in the mindes of men, shall upon the self same equity be let in.

Our Brethren go on in their answer thus; What we desire forbearance in, will countenance onely this, when men who give good testimony of their godlinesse and peaceablenesse, after all meanes used in faithfulnesse to know the minde of Christ, they yet cannot without fin to them enjoy all the ordinances of Christ, and partake in all the duties of worship as Members of that Congregation where their dwelling is; they therefore in humility and meeknesse desire they may not live without ordinances, but for the enjoyment of them for their edification in their spirituall good, may joyne in another Congregation; yet so as not condemning those Churches they joyn not with, as false, but still preserving all Christian communion with the Saints as Members of the same Body of Christ, of the Church Catholique, and joyn also with them in all duties of worship which belong to particular Churches so farre as they are able; if this be called Schisme, or countenance of Schisme, it is more then yet we have learned either from the Scriptures or any approved Authors.

We answer, The desired forbearance, which as they say, will countenance onely this, is a perpetuall division in the Church, and a perpetuall drawing away from the Churches under the rule; for they desire that they may have liberty to have Gongregations of persons gathered out of Churches under the rule, and that not only for themselves, but for all who are of their way, (and indeed upon the latitude of their grounds, for all who are, or may be of any other way, being so & so qualified,) & that not for a time, but for perpetuity; and onely this is a sufficient reason, why their desire cannot be granted to them in terminis; but to shew the justness of this desire of theirs, They first put a case, and then conclude, if this be called Schisme or countenance of Schisme, it is more then yet we have learned from the Scriptures or any approved Authors.

Whereunto we answer, 1 in generall, That the putting of cases is an usuall way of slipping out from the force of a reason, when no other answer can be given; and we desire our Brethren to give us their judgement upon their owne case

Iiii 2

pro-

propounded, as the face of it may be shewen in another glasse; suppose some Members of their own Congregations have such scruples as that they cannot without sinne to them enjoy all the ordinances of Christ, and partake in all the duties of worship as Members, as namely, they cannot allow the Baptizing of infants, and therefore that they may not live without ordinances, do separate into another Congregation, and then again some Members of that separated Congregation, shall so scruple some other particular doctrine or practice, that they cannot without fin to them (as they conceive) enjoy all the ordinances of Christ, or partake in all duties of worship as Members, and so shall yet joyn with them in another Congregation which concurs with them in their present principles, are these divisions and subdivifions as lawfull as they may be infinite? or must we give that respect to the error of mens consciences, as to satisfie their scruples by allowance of this liberty to them? & doth not this proclaime an univerfall liberty to all unto whom the limitations in the case may belong? and doth it not plainly signifie that error of conscience is a protection against Schisme: But we come to examine the case particularly.

1. They give the qualification of the persons for whom the forbearance is desired, They are men who give good testimony of their godliness and peaceableness after all meanes used in

faithfulne(s to know the minde of Christ.

We shall not minde our Bretheren how testimonies of godliness are not alwayes infallible protections either against Schisme or Heresie, least it should be judged a casting of odium to tell them that men who have been not only esteemed the authors of Schisme in the ancient Churches, have had great testimony of their strictnesse and integrity of life, as Meletius, Lucifer, Audeus; but even such as have been condemned justly by the ancient councels for Heresie; our brethren know what testimony in this respect hath been given by Cyril of Alexandria to Nestorius, and by Augustine to Pelagius.

gius. But we desire to know unto whom this testimony shall be given: and what assurance may be had that all they whom the brethren or others of their way shall gather into their congregations, whether Ministers or others, have used all meanes, yearl meanes in faithfulnesse to know the mind of Christ. May we not suggest to our brethren one means which hath been earnestly desired, and that many yeares, and never yet to this day by them attempted, namely a free and cleere fetting forth of their whole way and grounds out of Scripture for it, unto their brethren: by which meanes, either the weaknesse of their Reasons might have been so fully discovered, as that thereby they might have been moved to forfake this way, and continue in communion with us: or they might have discovered so much light unto us, beyond what hath upon any fearch of our own yet appeared, as that the rule might have been framed unto a generall content? Or who shall keep the doore of this forbearance being once set open, to prevent the entrance of such as are not in this manner qualified? especially considering that the grant of Toleration to all which will make use of it, is like to take off many from seeking satisfaction in their scruples, and using all meanes in faithfulnesse to know the mind of Christ, if they may without due tryall betake themfelves immediately to the indulgence. And so the Toleration may become a Sanctuary for such of our Churches to fly unto at pleasure from the government, upon such ends as are not at all consciencious, but carnall and corrupt; we therefore conceive it necessary for preventing manifold inconveniences, that amongst all other means used in faithfulnesse, this be one, that each person give account of his Scruples to the Eldership or Congregation where he dwels, that fo he may either receive satisfaction or have from them a testimony of godlinesse and peaceablenesse.

2. They propound the case of persons thus qualified, They cannot without sin to them enjoy all the ordinances of Christ,

and partake of all the duties of worship as Members of that Cen-

gregation where their dwelling is.

If they cannot in all, let them partake in as many duties and ordinances as they can, and let the indulgence onely supply that wherein they cannot, and not exempt them universally in that wherein they can; but we desire our Brethren to speak clearly and candidly, can they enjoy any one ordinance, or partake in any one duty in our Congregations as Members of them? we shall be glad to hear from our Brethren, that they can be Members of that Congregation where their dwelling is, If otherwise, to say they cannot partake in all, or enjoy all, is but concealedly spoken, since in truth they will partake in none at all as Members.

3. They therefore desire, They may not live without ordinances, but for the enjoyment of them for their edification in their spiritual good they may joyne in another Congregation.

This defire of joyning in another Congregation, is but petitio principii, and no answer to our reason against it; and whereas they say they must live without ordinances if they joyne with us as Members in our Congregations, 1. This implication is very aspersive, it being said indesinitely without ordinances, 2. It will not follow upon their own concession; for they confesse, they can occasionally joyn with us without sin, and if the occasionall joyning be lawfull, we cannot see why the constant should be sinfull. 3. When they fay they cannot enjoy ordinances without sin, if this sin be founded upon an error of conscience, as we are perswaded it is, our Brethren know that an erroneous conscience can so hamper and perplex a man, as that during such an error, he shall be bound under sin every. way, whether he crosse the dictate of his conscience, or followit; in which case further meanes and inquiry is to be used how to extricate the conscience out of these straites, and the person erring is bound to put away such an error, as being a finfull infirmity, and the Church no way bound of the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Bretheen. 7

to indulge a liberty of persisting in it, especially to the evi-

dent disturbance of her own peace.

4. They propound certaine limitations in the case; yet so tay they, as not condemning those Churches they joyn not with as false, but still preserving all Christian Communion with the saints as Members of the same body of Christ of the churche atholique, and joyn with them in all duties of worship that belong to

particular Churches so far as they are able.

We answer, I. What ever indulgence shall be granted, let this be the boundary of it which is given by the Brethren themselves; that such as give not testimony of their godliness and peaceablenesse, as have not used all meanes in faithfulnesse to know the minde of Christ, as do not condemne those Churches which they joyn not with as false, as do not preserve all Christian Communion with the Saints, nor joyn with them in all duties of worship that belong to particular Churches, as far as they are able, shall not have the benefit of this indulgence; and to the end that those words, so far as they are able, may not stand for a meer cypher, and signify nothing, let each man particularly declare in what ordinances or duties they are able to joyn, that so all totall separation may be prevented.

2. The not condemning of our Chruches as false, doth little extenuate the separation; for divers of the Brownists who have totally separated in former times, have not condemned these Churches as false; though they do not pronounce an affirmative judgement against us, yet the very separating is a tacite and practicall condemning of our Churches, if not false, yet as impure, eousg, as that in such administrations they cannot be by them as Members commu-

nicated with without sin.

3. As touching that expression of preserving all Christian communion with the Saints, as Members of the Same body of Christ, it is no vindication of our Churches at all when they depart from us the same may be said of any Saints living

in Sodome, in Casars houshold, in face Romuli, in false Churches: we do not find our Brethren willing to have communion with the Saints as Members of our Congregations, but as Members of the Church Catholique, which is as full a declining of communion with us as Churches, as if we were false Churches.

4. And whereas our Brethren say, that the for bear ance they defirewill countenance only this, which is speciously represented with all favourable circumstances in the case: we conceive under favour, that the desire of theirs in their third proposition goes somewhat further; for there they desire a liberty to have Congregations which themselves have explained to be, to hold those Congregations they already have, or to gather Members into a Congregation, or to adde to those they have already; now it is one thing for a scrupulous conscience to have liberty to joyn in another Congregation, as it is said in the case, and another thing to have liberty to beactive, and to gather Members out of our Churches, as is implied in the defire; for that would be to defire not only a liberty for consciences that are scrupulous, but a liberty to make consciences scrupulous by preaching or any other way infusing their principles into them, in order to the gaining of them into their Congregations; nor can we yet see how our Brethren, looking on their way as the counsell of God: and on the rule, as not founded on divine right, can allow themselves not to be in this manner active and sedulous to promote that which they judge Gods way, and to disparage that which they judge bur mans.

The Brethren having framed a case which is lesse then their desire in the third proposition, (and yet we seare, will not be the case of many who will make use of this indulgence,) conclude thus, If this be called Schisme or countenance of Schisme, it is more then yet we have learned either

from the Scripture, or any approved Author.

We answer, That it is not this new formed case, but

of the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Brethren. 73

th egranting of our Brethrens desire, in the third proposition as it stands in terminis, whereof we say that it would give countenance to a perpetual Schisme and division in the Church, which we do still averre is a thing of it self manifest; not that we think differences in judgement in this or that point to be Schisme, or that every inconformity unto every thing used or injoyned is Schisme, so that communion be preserved, or that separation from idolatrous communion or

worship ex se unlawfull, is Schisme; but

be free from communicating as Members in those Parishes where they dwell, but may have liberty to have Congregations of such persons who out of tenderness of conscience cannot communicate with us, but do voluntarily offer themselves to joyne in separate Congregations of another communion, which secession of our Members from usis a manifest rupture of our societies into others, and is therefore a Schisme in the body; and if the Apostle do call those divisions of the Church, wherein Christians did not separate into diverse formed Congregations of severall communion in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, Schismes, much in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, Schisme

either that our Churches are false, or our communion in ordinances exseunlawfull, but onely scruple of conscience, that a man cannot without sin as to him partake in all duties, and enjoy all ordinances, which is no cause of separating, nor doth it take off causelesse separation from being Schisme, which may arise from errors of conscience as well as carnall and corrupt reasons; therefore we conceive the causes of separation must be shewen to be such as ex natura rei will beare it out, which hath not yet been done by our Brethren, nor we think can be, and therefore we say that the granting of the liberty desired will give countenance to Schisme.

Kkkk

3. We

74 The Answer of the Sub-committee of the Divines

3. We cannot but take it for granted upon evidence of reason and experience of all ages, that this separation will be the mother and nutse of contentions, strifes, envyings, confusions, and so draw with it that breach of love, which may endanger the heightning of it into formall schisme even in the sense of our Brethren.

And we define our Brethren to shew out of Scriptures. and approved Authors what they have learned concerning schilme; for the breaking of Members from their Churches which are lawfully constituted Churches, and from communion in ordinances dispensed according to the word, without just and sufficient cause ex natura rei to justify such secession, and to joyne in other Congregations of separate communion, either because of personall failings in the Officers or Members of the Congregation from which they separate, or because of causelesse scruple of their own conscience, hath been accounted schisme, and the setting up altare contra altare, as the expression of former times was; and what is it else that approved Authors do call Schisme? Schisma, ni fallor ( saith Augustine ) est eadem opinantem, & codem ritu utentem solo Congregationis dele-Hari dissidio, & Schismaticos facit non diversa fides, sed communionis disrupta societas. Agreeable whereunto is that definition of schisme by Cameron, est schisma secessio in religionis negotio vel temeraria, vel injusta, sive facta su, sive continuata, and concurrently do other approved Authors fay, ide & operibe and we likewise conceive, that it is the cause of the separation from communion which gives both name and nature to schisme; for if that cause be unjust or insufficient according to the rule of the word of God, let our Brethren tell us what such a separation is.

In their 3: paragraph our Brethren proceed, And as for that irritation our Brethren speake of, we humbly conceive it will be according to the temper of mens hearts; if such a practice must with men whose hearts are gracious, it will onely irritate

Contra Pauhim, lib. 20. ap. 3. Ou. Evang. in

ju 11. & de

ap. 3. De Schismate.

the ma

of the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Brethren. 75

them to search further into the minde of Christ, and to walke before their Brethren with more exactness, and to exercise love, meekness and for bearance towards those Brethren who differ from them; and such irritation there is no great cause that either we

or our Brethren should make complaints of: If &c.

Answer. We know no evill which may not be excused by such a dilemma as this; what scandall, what heresie can arise, which will not operate upon men according to the temper of their hearts? which will not irritate those who are gracious to search the Scriptures? &c. for even Heresies saith the Apostle, must be, that they who are approved may be made manifest; we may not do evill, nor plead for evill, nor take it for granted that a thing is not evill, because good may come of it.

If this liberty, say they, meet with corruption, it is like enough there may be accidentally an irritation to sin; but the way then to oppose such corruption is by instruction, prayer, walking convincingly before them, & if they grow turbulent, to call in the help of the Civill Magistrate; but not to give that respect to their corruptions, as to deny to men who give underiable testimony of their godlinesse, that use of the ordinances of Christ that they may with

the peace of their consciences enjoy.

Answer, The irritation is not accidentall where the cause is causa per se; we cannot conceive that this irritation will be extra semper & frequenter, as accidentall effects are; for to omit the corruptions which this liberty may meet with in such as are not truly godly, will not this be an irritation of their corruptions that are true Members of the Church? yea haply not onely of their corruptions, but of their consciences and zeale to oppose such separation and drawing away of their Members as this is; the Corinthians were Saints, and yet by reason of the Schismes, contentions, and strife amongst them, they are charged to be yet carnall, and to walke as men; and if we consult our own experience already, this liberty meets with more whose

corruptions are too strong for their graces, then whose graces do make onely good use thereof; and because we already finde this assumed liberty to be an irritation to the worse, and not to the better, we have little reason to expect that being made more consident and bold by a toleration, it should be otherwise hereafter; nor do we thinke but such separation of Church-Members hath been heretofore, and therefore may surther be an irritation of corru-

ptions amongst themselves.

To the way they suggest of opposing such corruptions, however it may be good to prevent the evill effects it may have upon a mans owne heart; yet so long as the cause of all doth remaine, which is separation, and so long as men are men, we cannot conceive it will be otherwise, nor can we find in any age or history, but the like cause hath had the like effects; and though we acknowledge the Magistrates power to bridle turbulency, and to prevent or heale the breach of peace, yet the irritations will remaine, and be often breaking forth to the scandall of religion; and the trouble of the Magistrate is not likely to be so great in taking away the fuell, as in coming alwayes in to poure water upon the fire when it breakes out.

And as to that which they say, That such respect is not to be given to mens corruptions as to deny &c. This implication is scandalous, that the denying of this liberty is a giving respect to mens corruptions; for it is out of respect to the Churches peace and communion, and the covenanted uniformity; and yet doubtlesse though we may not give respect, yet we may have respect to mens corruptions so far as to prevent the irritation of them; else by this reason we must hand over head grant an universall coleration of all that are any way conscienciously scrupled, without looking to the probable events and consequences thereof, which may follow either by reason of the corruptions of others, or of the men themselves, who use this liberty; for it may

be:

be as well indulged with respect to mens corruptions, as denyed, except it can be undertaken that there shall be no corruption in them that desire and use it; It is our earnest desire and prayer that our Brethren might enjoy the ordinances with the peace of their consciences, and of the Church also, or that they would rather deny themselves of their full liberty in every point, then redeeme it at the price of so much danger and disquiet to the Churches of God.

## To the fixth reason our Brethren answer,

First in generall, our judgements do thus farre agree with yours that except upon very weighty considerations, husband and wife, master and servants should partake together in the same Mi-

zistry.

We take what they grant us, and cannot but thinke it strange that when our Brethren account us true Churches, agree with us in substance of doctrine and worship, in the most, and most substantial things of the rule for government, can occasionally joyne with us in the Sacraments, can hear with us and pray with us, there should yet be such weighty considerations behind (though they call the difference bet wixt us, Lesser matters) as to necessitate separation, and to ground an allowance for wife, childe, servant, to withdraw from that authority, which the master of the family hath to rule and oversee them in religious duties; but they proceed.

2. If it should happen to be otherwise, 1. All manner of confusion would not hereby be introduced into families; for can our Breibren think that persons agreeing in all the fundamentals of their faith, and who in their judgement and practice joyn in all the same duties of piety in the family, and also agree in the same duties of publick worship for the substance, though not living under the same individual ministry, yet unlesse they do agree also in an uniformity in every thing, both publike and.

Kkkk 3

pri-

private, they must needs runinto all manner of confusion: hash either nature or the gospell put such a necessity upon uniformity in lesser things to keep families from confusion? If this were the rule of the gospell, then except it prevaile upon the opinion of those whomit converts to such an uniformity (which it seldome doth) it must by this principle of necessity subvert humane society by bringing confusion into families, which we conceive to be a great derogation to the gospell.

Hereunto we answer, 1. The common people are not very likely from agreement in fundamentals, to draw consequences of mutuall forbearance, when they see Ministers, notwithstanding this, for these lesser matters, to withdraw & set up separate Churches, unto which they following them upon opinion of sin, and that in the worship of God, which is heightned with the notion of Wil-Worship, and even of Idolatry and Antichristianisme, must needs greatly endanger heavy contentions and confusion: no animosities being so great as those which rise out of differences in religion, specially

amongst those that live neer together.

Nor is it the meer want of uniformity (as our Brethren would inferre) which doth necessitate this, but such a positive difformity in opinion and practice, as that they who live together, and lie in the bosomes of one another, cannot (which is more then simply do not,) serve God together in publick, but divide a sunder, not unto a several ministry onely, but which is much more dangerous, unto a separated ministry, wherein so often as the doctrines which tend to justifie that separation shall be taught on the one side, and the contrary thereunto on the other, it is impossible for a family thus contrarily in the Members thereof instructed, to joyn together in mutual edification at home, without confusion.

2. If any differences in a family should arise, especially growing out of divided opinions in this matter of a Church way, as is most probable may, and that frequently, and

fuch

of the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Brethren. 79 fuch as may breake forth into publick scandal, and require the care of Ministers and Eldership to heale them, which we can show require in such a case for helps.

ther can they repaire in such a case for helpe, whose very disagreements are about the remedies that should cure

them?

3. Where husband and wife are divided into separated Congregations, they will certainly endeavour to draw children and servants to their way, whence savors and disfavors are likely to grow, and thereupon such jarrs and contentions in the samily, as may quickly amount to much confusion.

4. The very severall contributions unto the maintenance of severall Ministers, when a man must to his ownMinister, to his wives, to his childrens, as they severally shall scatter themselves, contribute, may not onely be a burden to the state of a man, but much more to his minde, when being perswaded his wife or children are in a sin of separation from him, he must yet be at charges to allow them therein; differences that strike this string, do often beget jarring discords, to say nothing of the bad uses, which ill mindes, or the many seares, which jealous mindes may draw from hence, when young women or children shall constantly depart for the ordinances, it may be some miles from one another, out of the sight, and from under the inspection and care of their parents or husbands, when it is certain they should enjoy as powerfull and edifying a ministry by staying at home.

Lastly, if a wife or child should be censured in their separated Congregations, that also might be a rise of domesticall contentions. In his own Congregation the husband should hear and understand the case, and have satisfaction in the known integrity of his own Eldership, or at least might have the benefit of an appeal, none of which he can have in a separated Congregation of which he hath no

knowledge.

2. Neither would it (say our Brethren) exceedingly, much

lesse altogether hinder the mutuall edification that might be offorded and received amongst them; for first although persons of the same family not living under the same ministry, may in some respect of family-duties not so fully edifie as otherwise, yet in a great measure they may, and if there be a zeale and good conscience in any of the family to be helpfull in good conference, it is no such great hinderance to hear in severall places, or severall Freachers, as schollers reading severall books of then conferring; many good Christians have for edification purposely practised it, and it hath some advantages for edification which the other way hath not.

Answer, Our Brethren grant that this course hindereth fuch full edification in some respect, as might otherwise be had; and furely this some respect is a very great one, when there shall be none to help the memories, to clear the doubts, to remove the mistakes, to supply the defects of the rest, none to inculcate the duties, to kindle and mutually warme the affections, or to whet thethings which might joyntly have been learned, upon the consciences of one another, and having been more joyntly affected in the publique difpensation of them, to be the better enabled with joynt fervency of spirit to begge a blessing upon them; and verily when we are commanded to do all things unto edification, and to follow those things whereby one may edify another, if any course be more a hinderance then a furtherance unto edification, we know not how upon principles of conscience a man should constantly be bound unto such a course; Schollers may better profit by conferring their observations out of severall books, then ordinary people by bringing broken, and it may be mistaken and incoherent notes from severall sermons; in that of schollers there is nothing but speculative or intelle & uall benesit aymed at; here the heart, conscience, affections are to be kindled, and further quickned by mutuall conference, and affistance in the duties they heard before, which is

of the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Brethren. 81

more effectually done when severall persons have been joyntly warmed and stirred up in the same Congregation; besides books in that case may agree, when in our case, sermons may not; for one may hear a fermon for separation, another for communion, and so conferring of notes will be but the repeating of contradictions in the family; and though some in the family may have zeale and good conscience to helpe the rest, yet what will this availe those whose understandings and memories being weak have none to improve and further them in the things which they near themselves? we are confident, no humble Christians who know their own weaknesse, and are tender of the weaknesse of others, will dare to pretend their getting advantage in matter of edification from the ordinances by thus confrant dividing and scattering the family into severall Congregations; and therefore our Brethren do confesse that there is a further degree of edification which comes to persons in a family by going all to the same ministry;

But then they further proceed and say,

2. That this amounts not to that proportion as to countervaile the want of enjoying the publick ordinances for ever, which compared with family-duties simply considered have had the preeminence, both in respect to Gods glory, and the edification of souls, in all mens concessions, which cannot be enjoyed by many that yet are truly conscientious, except the liberty

petitioned be granted.

Answer. What ordinances must our Brethren want for ever? they have told us they could not joyn in some ordinances without sin; here they speak plainer, and if that they say be pertinent to the argument, they tell us they cannot enjoy the ministry of the word without sin in our Congregations; for if they can, and if by their own confession there is a further degree of edification by going all of a family to the same ministry, then by dividing, with what warrant do they divide, in that wherein they can joyn,

even to the prejudice of edification? They have told us before, they can hear our Ministers, and allow them to preach amongst them as Ministers, and occasionally receive the Lords Supper with us, and admit us with them; and if all this may be without fin, must yet the toleration defired be upon this ground granted, because else many truly. conscientious must want the publick ordinances, & that for ever; we understand neither the Logick, nor Divinity of this answer.

We confesse to family-duties simply considered, publick ordinances are to be preferred; but if one must be lost for the other, we think that which is cansa per se of such an inconvenience, to wit such a separation, is even eo nomine

unjust.

2. They adde, for the account governors in great families are to take off all in their families attending upon the ordinances and of their profitting thereby; We answer, The Churches me defire being constant and fixed, it is no more impossible then it was for a godin tutor in the university to take account of his pupils ha-

ving liberty to go to severall Churches.

To which we reply; The case is different; schollers can write, and give a ready account; every childe or fervant in a family cannot do so, nor be by the governor helped who heard not with him. 2. Schollers sometimes have deceived their tutors with false notes, and so may children or servants; what security is or can there be that they will go constantly to their Congregation, and not to tavernes, alehouses, or some other ill employment? 2. What time will there be for receiving an account of so many sermons? Add hereunto the different hours of going and returning, which may exceedingly hinder family duties, none of which inconveniences will be remedied by the fixedness of the separated Churches.

4. They say, Whereas it is heightned, that twenty of one family may possibly be of twenty Churches, we suppose if the State of the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Brethren. 8

State be pleased to grant us the liberty we petition for, that they in their wisedome (to which we have referred our selves) will take into consideration the limiting such Congregations unto a certain number, and there may not then be twenty Churches in

any City or Towne to divide them selves into.

To this we answer, that it is true according to the judgement of our Brethren who make those many thousands of Christians which were converted at Jerusalem, to have been no argument of more then one Congregation in that City, that conformably thereunto a very few Congregations may serve to gather a great multitude of Members; but we know not how the principles and grounds of our Brethrens desire can allow them to rest in any set number, if they prove too few for such Multitudes as they may gather out of our Churches into them; for their petition being indefinite for multitudes of persons, cannot be well definite for number of places or Congregations; but whether they be more or fewer, they will be abundantly enough to distract even a very great family and hinder their mutuall edification, and the taking and giving of a sure and profitable account, to the great greife of the husband, parent, and governor, to have his family so authorized to forsake him, and that he, (to adde that to all the other considerations) who for his own benefit would be glad of their help, must want that, as well as they want his.

Our Brethren conclude their answerthus; But the truth is, those that thus plead against this permission which we desire as insufferable, must certainly suppose that men are to be tied throughout this Kingdome to their own Parish Churches where they live, both masters and servants, and that not onely for Sacraments, but for constant bearing; which how burdensome it was in former times, the godly people are very sensible of; and now in the time of reformation, it sindes many Ministers who cannot be cast out by order of law, though bad and unprositable, as appears by the leaving them out of the Classes; and shall

the people be tred to live under them as their Ministers, who are not worthy to joynin government with your selves? and for time to come as places are void, they must be supplied by the choice of others for them, or by themselves; if by themselves, all Parishes: are not reformed as concerning the people, and the major part being generally the worst, the Ministers chosen by them, will be such as the godly cannot live under their Ministry; if by others, those who are the choosers may also be such, as they cannot be denyed by law their right in chosing, and so also unprofitable Ministers may be put upon the godly people; and if they be not tyed to their parishes the weight of this reason, and the inconveniences presented will fall more heavy upon the numerous multi-

tude of Parishes, in City and Country.

Answer. To the pains which in this Paragraph our Brethren have taken in setting forth for the present, and prophelying for the future of the unprofitableness and unworthiness of the Ministers in many of our Parochiall Congregations under which godly men cannot live, we will reply no more but this, that it a crimination which might well have been spared in a time of endeavoured and covenanted reformation; for it seemes to intimate one of these two things, either that there is an impossibility in natura rei for a profitable ministry to be for the time to come generally setled in our Churches, or that being possible in itselfe, there would be some defect in those by whose zeal, power and wisedome, this so important a particular of reformation should be promoted: neither of which we thinke our Brethren either will or can affirme.

Neither is it equall to argue from the former times of unjust vexation, when men were tyed to their Parishes, though there were no preaching Minister, or one who preached errors, or opposed godlines, unto these times wherein men have covenanted against every thing that is of this

nature.

Nor do we beleeve that our Brethren meane that onely fuch of the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Brethren.

fuch should be allowed to gather into their Congregations who live under bad and unprofitable Ministers, though that

be the onely medium here used against our reason.

But to the whole we answer in breisethus much; I. That we never did, do, nor shall deny any Members of our Congregations to hear or communicate occasionally elsewhere. And 2. That we doubt not, but by the blessing of God upon the reformation to be setled, there will be that concurrent care of patrons, people, Classes, as that there shall be no such unworthy Ministers from whom any conscientious Christian shall be forced constantly to withdraw himself; and where the ministry is without just exception, we referre it to our Brethrens own consciences, and to the practice of their Congregations, to say how sit it is that the Members should ordinarily, much lesse constantly, seek the ordinances elsewhere.

LIII 3

FEB.



## FEB. 2. 1645.

The Committee met again, and the Diffenting Brethren brought in a Paper containing a Reply to a fecond Part of the Answer of the Sub-committee, to the Desires of the Diffenting Brethren, Dec. 15.1645.

## Which is as followeth.

Though it is our desire rather to answer to the Papers brought in by our Brethren, before we go on any further; yet because the Committee requires us to go on, we humbly submit these Papers to the consideration of this Honourable Committee.

Our Breihren say.

"II. "That none are to be allowed upon differences only in matter of government, to withdraw Communion from us in things wherein they declare an agreement: But seesing it is confessed in Worsbip and Doctrine, we are one, and have covenanted to endeavor the nearest conjunction and uniformity, there may be no such indulgence granted to any as may constitute them in distinct separate Consergations, as to these parts of worship where they can joyn in communion with us, but only some expedient may be indeavoured how to be with them in the particulars, wherein they cannot agree with us.

III. "For

III. "For this purpose we humbly offer.

"Cannot joyn to partake of the Lords Supper, shall repaire to the Minister and Elders for satisfaction in their scruples, which if they cannot receive, they shall not be compelled to communicate in the Lords Supper: provided that in all other parts of worship, they joyn with the congregation wherein they live and be under the government of that congregation.

"That such as in this manner are under the government of that congregation wherein they live, and are not
Officers therein, being of the Independent udgement,
Inall seek satisfaction as in the former proposition, which is
they cannot receive, they shall not be compelled to be under the power of censures from Classes or Synods: provided
that they continue under the government of that congregation, and that no man who hath submitted to Classis and
Synods, shall decline them, in any case, pendente lite.
Answer.

is and hath been against, namely, to be Members or Pastors of the Parishes as now they are; for the Honourable Houses think not meet as yet to give power to the Ministers by a law to purge the Congregations so farre as the Assembly it self desireth; and note have not as you know, presumed to seeke the alteration of the rule established; And the rule for purging the Parishes given up by the Assembly it self, to the Honourable Houses, is not onely short, but exclusive of what, we in our consciences thinke, is required by God for the qualification of Members: so that it is not to us in view, how the Parishes shall be reformed,

A Reply of the Dissenting Brethren to the Second Pars to that which will satisfie our consciences. And as the divines of the Reverend Assembly have said, they cannot without sin administer the ordinances to the Parishes as they stand; so neither can we continue or become Members or Pastors according to our principles; and we humbly desire that our consciences may be considered herein for sorbearance, as our Brethren desire that theirs may for power by a law.

2. If we could. Yet according to what is proposed, we must for ever want that great ordinance of the
Lords Supper, which cannot but much prejudice us to
the Elders and Members of the Congregation, from
whose communion we thus separate; and yet we must
be under their government and censures thus prejudiced by us; which how unreasonable it will be, we desire our Brethren to consider.

3. All this supposeth also that we are to be under the government of a Church whereof we are not Members; for we account not living in the Parishes to be sufficient to make a Member of a Church; nor did many of you.

4. It supposeth this ground (the reason of which we see not, only the charity of it we cannot but wonder at) that because we come so near in doctrine and worship and communion with you, therefore we must not have an indulgence in a difference which yet con-

cerns the edification of our foules by ordinances that are somecessary.

"For the Ref A Sons the Reverend Brethren do

"give, That seeing it is confessed in worship and

"doctrine we are one, and have covenanted to en
"deavor the nearest conjunction and uniformity,

"there inay be no such indulgence granted to any

"as may constitute them in distinct separated

"Congregations as to those parts of worship

"where they can joyn in communion with us;

we Answer.

Whereas the uniformity sworn to in the Covenant, is now urged here upon this occasion, and continually upon the like turned as the great argument against us in pulpits, presses, and ordinary treaties, as if what we defired were contrary thereunto: this argument cannot hold against us, without affixing an interpretation upon that part of the Covenant, and that according to our Brethrens principles only, to the prejudice of ours; who when we tooke this Nationall Covenant were known to be of the Same principles we now are of; and yet this Covenant, was professedly to attempered in the first framing it, as that we of different judgements might take it both parties being present at the framing of it in Scotland: and if this should be the way of urging, it is as free for us to give, our interpretation, of the latitude or nearnesse of uniformity intended, as for our Brethren; we having been Mmmm present

90 A Reply of the Dissenting Brethren to the Second Part

present at the debates of the Assembly about it; and wel know and remember the sense that there was held forth thereof; And further the Assembly being appointed by order of the Honourable House of Commons bearing date September 15. 1643. To set forth in a Declaration the grounds that have induced the Assembly to give their opinions, that this Covenant may be taken in point of conscience, according to which, some of us were by a Committee entrusted to bring in materials to that purpose, and accordingly did, which materials were committed to one of us, by a Sub-Committee to draw up; and among many other things that which followes, as grounds of taking the Covenant, as touching that first article, viz. That we shall endeavor to bring the Churches of God in the three Kingdomes to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in religion, confession of faith, forme of Church-government, directory of worship and catechismy, that we and our pofterity after us, may as Brethren live in faith and love, and the Lord may delight to dwell in the midst of us.

This indeavour in our places and callings, for uniformity, we apprehended the meaning of it to be.

That as in our ranks and stations we should indeawour it: so according to those generall warrants of the word, to regulate such an indeawour

in the use of means, whereby to accomplish it. And therefore, as for the patterne, the word of God is to be in our seye: fo, for the way and meanes and progresse in reducing the Churches to such an uniformity, such rules are to be observed, as the nature of such a work will beare; and which the Apostles (who had infallibility) observed in reducing the Jewes, and those of the circumcision, and the Gentiles to an uniformity; and without tyranny and pressing mens consciences beyond the severall degrees of light, which God vouchsafes to severall Churches more or lesse. So that although there be one patterne in our eye in common, which all our consciences swear to bring all to; yet de facto and in the providence of God, it so fals out, in the reforming of Churches (now after Anti-Christianisme bath over-spread and corrupted all) that the light growes every age more and more, to the perfect day and the coming of Christ, who is to melt that man of sinne, by the increasing brightnesse of his coming : and so both of persons and Churches some see more, some see lesse; and as we see in the reformed Churches at this day; and will certainly fall out thus, in these of ours. Now therefore in this case that rule for effecting this uniformity must certainly be no other then what the Apostle gives, Phil. 3.

92 A Reply of the Diffenting Brethren, to the Second Part.

As farre as we have attained a let us walk by the same rule. And therefore the way is to see how farre we have attained, and set down wherein we agree, (as in all substantials of faith and worship it is certain we shall ) and so to walk by that as the same rule; And then in such matters wherein men are otherwise minded, to leave it to God and such good meanes, that God may reveal it to them in his time, as

bis promise is.

But if an uniformity, for uniformities sake, ( And so the argument of our brethren here runs ) that is, affecting uniformity, so much as not to regard mens consciences, should be pressed and urged by such meanes, as formerly, without respect had to that variety of light, in matters of a lesser nature, this were beyond the callings and warrants of the word; and will prove aperfect tyranny; and will be so farre from being a means of love, which is aimed at, that it will lay the foundation of confusion and dissention, as formerly it did. It is with Churches, as with men and particular Saints, they are of severall Sizes and growth, of severall statures, and as men are left to be more or lesse holy, as God by good meanes shall make them, so must Churches. As it were against nature, to firetch a low man to the same length with a taller,

taller, or to cut a tall man to the stature of one that is low for uniformities sake: so to bring both more grown, or more reformed Churches to a middle stature for complyance with others, and for meer uniformities sake.

And this suits as with the rules of the word, so with the scope of the Article; For first look what kind of uniformity in confession of faith, the like in matter of worship and governement is to be intended; and that the rather because directions for government and worship are the more remote from all Christians knowledge, and perhaps more obscure in the word; and are the speciall controversies of the times. Now as in matters of faith you would not for uniformities sake, determine all differences in judgement but fundamentals, (and an uniformity therein is all intended,) so by analogie in point of worship and government. And secondly, the end is that God may dwell amongst us, which is the author of peace, not of confusion in all the Churches: which peace (whilst in his providence mens judgements do and will differ ) will never be attained by a rigid uniformity.

But this order of the Honourable House of Commons, so necessary for the satisfaction of all differing Mmmm 3 judge94 A Reply of the Dissenting Brethren, to the Second Part &c. Judgements: as at first to take the Covenant, so to continue stedfast therein; and which would in all likely-hood have laid a foundation of this and other differences, was super-seded to this day.

II. We answer, that we willingly again do professe that in the substance of worship and doctrine, we are one, and of the same judgement with our brethren, yet to practice and injoy those parts of worship, as ordinances of a Church, there is (as to our consciences) necessarily required, as the seat and subject of worship and other ordinances, a Church-state; and those such Churches, as where we may be members and joyn in Communion therein as members without sin, which we cannot do as we have all along professed; and such Churches, as wherein we can injoy all ordinances, which is denied us here in this Paragraph. So that the only way left to reduce us to an uniformity and conjunction in the same practices, is, to allow us such distinct Churches from yours, according to our principles, in which and by meanes of which, we shall hold all possible communion and conformity with yours: whereas otherwise, we shall only retain an uniformity in judgement: whereas that uniformity the Covenant much rather obligeth you and ns all unto, is that which may be an uniformity in practice with Satisfaction to all mens consciences, and their edificatton.

The

## द्वेद्धिक्षेत्रेक्षिक्षेत्रेक्षेत्रेक्षेत्रेक्षेत्रेक्षेत्रेक्षेत्रेक्षेत्रेक्षेत्रेक्षेत्रेक्षेत्रेक्षेत्रेक्

## March 9. 1645.

The Committee met again, and the Sub-committee prefented an Answer to the last Paper of the Dissenting Brethren, which is as followeth.

The Answer of the Sub-committee of Divines unto the fourth Paper of the Dissenting Brethren, prefented to the Honourable Committee.

Our Brethren being ordered by the Honourable Committee to go on upon the Paper brought in by the Sub-committee touching indulgence, are not pleased to take notice of those particulars of forbearance, which are therein offered to consideration; though this would much have conduced unto the expediting of the businesse of this Honourable Committee, and encouraged us to have studied some further meanes for their accommodation; neither do they bring in any reasons out of Scripture to justifie their desire of that which we say cannot be granted them in terminis. But thus they begin;

Though it is our desire, rather to auswer to the Papers brought in by our Brethren, before wee go on any further; yet because the Committee requires us to go on, we humbly submit these Pa-

pers to the consideration of this Honourable Committee.

To which we answer, That before our last Papers were brought in, they were ordered by the Committee to confider of this former Paper, and had a moneths time so to have done, but have still declined it upon other reasons then they here expresse, and seeme more willing to lengthen the

work into tedious and fruitlesse disputes against those things which do not please them, then to expresse a reall endeavour of bringing things to an agreement sofarre as may be, by so much as taking notice of those parts of our Paper, which tend thereunto; leaving therefore the two last paragraphs of our Paper utterly unobserved, they single out onely one proposition, against which this present Paper of theirs is wholly directed, wherein our words are these;

That none are to bee allowed upon differences in matters onely of Governement, to withdraw communion from us in things wherein they declare an agreement; but seeing it is confessed in Worship and Doctrine we are one, and have covenanted to endeavour the nearest conjunction and uniformitie; there may be no such indulgence granted to any as may constitute them in distinct separated Congregations, as to those parts of Worship wherein they can joyne in Communion with us, but onely some expedient may be endeavoured how to be are with them in the particulars wherein they cannot agree with us.

Hereuntothey reply distinctly; 1. To our advice; 2. To the reasons of it; against our advice they have four pa-

ragraphs, the first of which is in these words.

This supposeth, what our professed judgement is and hath been against, namely to be Members or Pastors of the Parishes as now they are; for the Honourable Houses thinke not meete as yet to give power to the Ministers by a law to purge the Congregations so farre as the Assembly it selfe desireth; and we have not (as you know) presumed to seeke the alteration of the rule established: And the rule for purging the Parishes given up by the Assembly it selfe to the Honourable Houses; is not onely short, but exclusive of what we in our consciences thinke is required by God for the qualification of Members, so that it is not to us in view how the Parishes shall be reformed to that which will satisfie our consciences; and as the Divines of the Reverend Assembly have aid, they cannot without sinne administer the ordinances to the Parishes

of the Assembly, to the Reply of the Diffenting Brithren. 97

Parishes as they stand, so neither can we continue or become Members or Pastors according to our principles; and we humbly desire that our consciences may be considered herein for forbearance, as our Breibren desire that theirs may for power by

alam.

Whereunto we answer, What that is which they call their professed judgement, would much more clearly appeare unto us, if we could ever obtaine that, which hath been fo long and so much defired, namely, a full and distinct modell of their way: but for the thing in hand we had no reafon to suppose, that what we advised was contrary to the judgemeat of our Brethren; sure we are when at this Honourable Committee it was pressed upon our Brethren then present to declare whether they would joyn in communion with us in those things wherein they doctrinally agreed; they did not then declare it to be contrary to their professed judgment, nay the vote which was then made to be reported to both Houses, namely, that if the Congregations were purged, it would very much tend to accommodation, was passed, nemine contradicente; and why our Brethren should make the notion of Parishes, as now they are, as a ground of separation, when they know further reformation is covenanted, and intended, we know no reason: must the communion of true Churches beforfaken in all things, because in some things they want reformation, and that even then when reformation is endeavoured? must a man refuse to live in any part of his house, because some one chamber or other is out of repaire, and about to be mended? It is no. good Logick as to our own houses, and we thinke it is no better as to Gods: we could not but look upon it as reasonable (whatever our Brethrens judgement is) that in those things wherein there is a doctrinal agreement, (as in faith and worship, our Brethren professe) there might be amongst men, so agreeing, a practicall communion, especially considering that they can occasionally joyn with Nnnn

112

us in those other things, concerning which their principles differ, which could not but put us in hope that some expedient to salve that difficulty might the more easily have been provided. And if our Brethren may be neither Members nor Pastors of any of our Congregations, how come they or what calling have they to have any ministerial relation at all unto them? they preach to them, they receive maintenance from them, when a delinquent Pastor hath been sequestred, they have entred upon his place, and received the profits of it; we know our Brethren do not preach to our people as Apostles, Evangelists, or Prophets; nor without any ministerial mission: and if they preach the word to them virtute muneris, as the Ministers of Christ, and as unto professed Christians, not as unto Pagans (as we hope they do, ) why they may not stand in relation of membership as well of ministry or teaching, eousque at least as they do doctrinally agree with us, we know no cause; we look upon preaching the word as an office, which no man ought to exercise except he be sent, Rom. 10. 15. if our Brethren may be unto our Congregations aliquousque & quoad hoc Officers, why not in like manner Members? especially since we beleeve our Brethrens judgement is, that men may be Members in a Church wherein there are not (either out of the exigence, or out of the iniquity of the times) all the ordinances distinctly to be found in being, much lesse in perfection; the Church of Israel was fourty years together without circumcifion in the wildernesse: and is it unlawfull for Christians who live in Kingdomes where there are not in-Ecclesiasticall Congregations every office or ordinance, suppose Deacons, or Ruling-Elders, or the like (the doctrine and worship being otherwise pure) to live as Members in those Churches? if they may so do notwithstanding the totall want of one ordinance, why may not our Brethren do the like with us, notwithstanding a graduall defect onof the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Bret brin. 99

ly in another, especially, when some expedient is endeavoured to cure that defect as to them; and when separation, both by the intrinsecall evill of it self, and by the example which is thereby given unto as many as will to despise our Churches, and by the pernicious use which ill minded men may make of it to hinder both reformation in the Church and tranquillity in the State, doth evidently threaten so

much danger unto us.

They tellus, That the Honourable Houses thinke not meet as yet to give power to the Ministers by a law to purge the Congregations so farre as the Assembly it selfe desireth: They herein intimate that the Assembly hath defired a power to be given to the Ministers more then the Houses thinke fit to grant; we desire our Brethren to shew where the Assembly have defired or adviced the power which they conceive needfull for ordering of the Church to be placed in the Ministers, without mentioning of others who concurre with them: if they cannot, they must give us leave to look on such expressions, rather as artifices then as arguments; but have our Brethren at all waited to see what the Honourable Houses with the advice of the Assembly would do in the reformation of the Church? did they forbeare separarion till it appeared what power the Hcuses would grant? did not they anticipate the advice of the Affembly, and the resolutions of the Parliament in gathering Churches out of ours, before they could foresee, or be able with a judgement either of truth or charity to conc'ude that our Churches notwithstanding reformation begun, promised, covenanted, would continue indeed as to them unreformed still why do they argue from what the Houses thinke not meete to do, or from what the Assembly hath thought fit to advise, when themselves thought meete to separate before the one or the other was known? sure we are, that we are little beholding to our Brethren, for helping forwards those desires of ours for such a measure of reformation as themselves acknowledge to be good, and we Nnnn 2 beleeve

100 The Answer of the Sub-committee of the Divines

beleeve to be sufficient, when one of them hath publickly professed that he would not joyn with us while he lived, and it was said in the open Assembly that though the thing we desired was good, yet they would not concurre with us in it, because it would be an hinderance unto them; but for our parts, though our Brethren refuse to joyn with us in what themselves acknowledge to be good, yet we doubt not but God who hath stirred up the Honourable Houses to begin so happy a reformation, will by them in his good time confummate it, though our Brethren withdraw their affistance: and yet we cannot see what singular excellency the reformation which our Brethren would seeme to aime at, hath above what the Assembly have advised; for they have told us that they would admit Anabaptists, (and we suppose upon the same grounds Antinomians and Arminians ) into communion; and one of our Brethren hath said, that in their way, if a man declare himselfe willing to joyne with them in all the ordinances of Christ so farre as he knowes, this is Covenant sufficient to joyn hinself with them; we thinke that most in our Churches within the power of the Parliament have undertaken as much, as this comes to, in the Nationall Covenant.

They adde, That they have not presumed to seek the alteration of the rule established. I. They endeavor to make it void in all respects unto themselves. 2. They presume to practice contrary to it without the civill sanction or toleration, which we conceive comes much nearer to the formall nature of a presumption, then when a reformation is but begun, and in seri, for those who are called together to advise about it, by way of humble petition, to desire not the alteration, but the further persection of the rule. 3. To seeke a total exemption from a rule, hath surely more of considence in it, then to desire that, unto that which is done already, more may be added with a purpose to submit to all. Our Brethren seeke no alteration in the rule, because they intend not to be subject

of the Assembly, to the Reph of the Dissenting Brethren. 101

to it. 4. The more defective the rule is, the more colour will they have for separation and gathering of Churches, and are likely to gain the more people from us: we wonder not at all, that our Brethren being vigilant enough upon their own interest, do not seek an alteration of the rule in melius, when it might rend to the prejudice of that; we believe their piety would dictate and justifie as great a presumption as this they speake of, if their wisedome did not look upon it as inconvenient to themselves.

They say, The rule for purging the Parishes given up by the Assembly it selfe to the Honourable Houses, is not onely short, but exclusive, of what we in our consciences think is required by

God for the qualification of Members.

Though our Brethren tell us in their Paper afterwards that a short man is not to be stretched to the length of a taller; yet we cannot but wonder at their modesty, which when the rule given is not onely short, but exclusive of what God requires, doth not presume to seeke the alteration of it; we assure our selves that the Honourable Houses are so tender of the truth of God, as never to esteeme that presumption which seekes the alteration of that, that is exclusive of what God requires; but withall we wonder likewise at this whole expression of theirs, in their last Paper they told us, that they had the same rule for qualification of Members which the Assembly it selfe holds forth; here they say our rule is exclusive of what they in conscience thinke is required, nemo tam prope tam proculque nobis; this constraines us to importune them for their rule for qualification of Members, that it may be clearly laid downe and debated.

So that it is not in view (say they) to us how the Parishes shall be reformed to that which will satisfie our consciences; we think this is no good argument for separating from true Churches, because it is not to us in view how they shall be reformed; but so long as reformation is in sieri, we judge it more consonant to piety and Christian unity, to waite

Nnnn 3

upon

102 The Answer of the Sub-committee of the Divines

upon God, till we see what issue his power and providence will bring things unto. In the meane time we long to know, and have desired in the Assembly what reformation of our Parishes will satisfie our Brethrens consciences, or how this Kingdome may be made the Kingdome of the Lord and of his Christ, better then by dividing the inhabitants of it into severall parts by the bounds of their dwelling, that all who give up their names to Christ, may be taughtand governed, and have all ordinances administred amongst them sutable to their condition.

They alleadge the example of the Assembly; As the Divines ( say they ) of the Reverend Assembly have said they cannot without sin administer the ordinances to the Farishes as they stand. so neither can we continue or become Members or Pasters according to our principles; and we humbly desire that our consciences may be considered herein for forbearance, as our Brethren defire that theirs may for power by a law. What sect in the Kingdome is there which may not plead exemption from the rule, and liberty to act what it felfe thinkes fit by fuch an agreement as this? The Assembly never refused communion in Parochiall Churches, nor diffiked the distinguishing of Congregations by locall bounds; but they cannot administer to wicked and scandalous persons in those Parishes; such men are on all hands confessed to be apparently unworthy: doth it follow that because we do desire a power to keepe away those who are truly scandalous upon principles confessed by all; therefore they upon error of judgement (as we suppose) may desire a power to keepe away those who are not scandalous, but as to knowledge and visible converfation duely qualified? they would faine make our defire looke like a desire of Power, theirs onely as a desire of forbearance, when in truth they desire a greater power then we either do or dare desire: we desire to keep away onely those that are scandalous, and to have a rule to strengthen us therein; they do not onely keep all such away, but many

of the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Breshren. 103 more, without ether rule warranting them, or a forbearance permitting them; some better way would be found out to surther their owndesires, then by misrepresenting ours.

Their second paragraph is in the sewords; If we could, yet according to what is proposed, we must for ever want that great ordinance of the Lords Supper, which cannot but much prejudice us to the Elders and Members of the Congregation from whose communion we thus separate, and yet we must be under their government and censures thus prejudiced by us, which how unreasonable it will be, we desire our Brethren to con-

sider.

Weanswer. 1. That it doth not follow if they be Members of our Congregations that they must for ever want the Lords Supper; except they will say that unto the receiving of the Lords Supper, it is necessarily requisite that a man be a formall Member of that Congregation where he receives it; if they affirme this, what then becomes of their occasionall communion? if not, why may not some expedient satisfie them in this to prevent so great an evill as separation? for they here do themselves professe separation from communion with us. 2. We may not do evil for any good end, if a man should be brought to such a straite, as that either he must want the Lords Supper, or separate from the Congregation whereof he is a Member, he may here want the ordinance (during this error of his conscience) with lesse danger, then to purchase it by a sinfull separation; this is a strange and dangerous way of arguing, which may open a gap to as many divisions and sub-divisions in the Church as the errors are unto which the mindes of men are subjects if one mans conscience cannot allow the word preached bur. according to a diverse fancy, which he hath framed to himscife, another not hold communion where infants are baptized, another not receive the Lords Supper but after his own supper, or in such kinde of bread or wine, asis not in use

or the like; if such perswassons of conscience, when men cannot receive the ordinances, but according to their own private principles, shall be a sufficient ground for renouncing of membership, we desire our Brethren to consider how long not our Churches onely, but their own, or any other Churches in the world shall be free from incurable unquietnesse. 2. If our Brethrens consciences through error do cause prejudice against them, is it unreasonable for them to be under the government of that Church which is prejudiced by them? may they with good reason scandalize the Church by separation, and the Church have no reason to governe them? then prejudicating or scandalizing errors are a Supersede as to all government, we do not then wonder that errors and perverse opinions so much abound; it may be they are all but the mediums to liberty, and exemptions from government, 4. There can no such prejudice remaine against them, if what they do, they do only by vertue of a speciall indulgence.

In their third paragraph they say; All this supposeth also, that we are to be under the government of a Church whereof we are not Members, for we account not living in the Parishes to be sufficient tomake a Member of a Church, nor did many of you.

What our Brethren meane by all this we know not; we are sure there is no such supposition can be drawn out of the words of our proposition against which this Paper of our Brethren doth militate; it hath not one word of Government to this sense in it, but only of Communion; it doth not suppose men to be under the government of a Church whereof they are not Members, but it doth expressly suppose that they may be Members in a Church, and hold a practical communion so farre as they do doctrinally agree, and to those purposes having forbearance as to those other ordinances wherein they differ: But it is worth the observing how our Brethren avoid government by withdrawing of membership, cut out their names as it were out of the

of the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Brethren. 105

Colledge book, that they may free themselves from the discipline thereof; what Herese, Schisme, or Scandall hath not by this meanes a ready way to escape all government? we grant that living in Parishes is not sufficient to make a Member, a Turke, or Pagan, or Idolater may live within the bounds of a Parish, and yet be no Member of a Church; a man must therefore first in order of nature be a Member of the Church Visible, and then living in a Parish, and making profession of Christianity, he may claime admission into the society of Christians within those bounds, and enjoy the priviledges and ordinances which are there dispensed.

In their fourth paragraph they say; It supposeth this ground, the reason of which we see not, onely the charity of it we cannot but wonder at, that because we come so neare in doctrine and worship and communion with you, therefore we must not have an indulgence in a difference which yet concernes the edification

of our soules by ordinances that are so necessary.

We thinke our proposition was not so destitute either of reason or charity as our Brethren would seem to charge upon it; The reason in it was this, that doctrinal lagreement should preserve practicall communion in the things wherein that agreement flood. The charity this, 1. that we did desire to continue Fellow-members with our Brethren in Church-unity and to prevent separation. 2. That for that purpose we did advise some expedient to be endeavoured how to beare with them in the particulars wherein they cannot agree with us; if notwithstanding our agreement in most things, and those most substantiall, nothing will satisfie our Brethren, but a separation from us ( the word is their own in the second paragraph) and they cannot be edified without scandalizing the Church of God, we leave it to all men to judge whose charity is greatest, theirs who labour to preferve union, or theirs who resolve to separate and break it; we thinke that charity bindes Christians to prevent all un-0000 iust

just and needlesse separation; and suppose Brownists, Anabaptists or Antinomians were in our Brethrens Congregations, and they should finde out some expedient to hold communion still with them, and so prevent their separation, would this be esteemed a breach of charity? or is all expedient to this purpose impossible, save onely renouncing of membership? our Brethren must give us leave to wonder at their charity as well as they do at ours, that comming so near to us in Doctrine and Worship, nothing should content them but a separation.

Thus farre our Brethren have made observations upon our advice; in all that follows they endeavor to answer the reasons of it; where we cannot by the way but take notice what an edge our Brethren have against Uniformity, and how hastily (as it is said of Benhadads servants) they catch at that word to make a large discourse upon it, although had that word been left out of our Paper, the force of the reason would have been the very same which now

it is.

Their answer to our reasons is partly argumentative, and partly historicall; we shall breifly consider both. They tell us, That the uniformity sworn in the Covenant is not only here upon this occasion, but continually, on the like, turned as the great argument against them in pulpits, presses, and ordinary treaties, as if what they defired were contrary thereunto; how it is elsewhere turned against them by others we know not; if any do it either uncharitably or irrationally, (which we beleeve none that are wise and fear God would do) let them answer for themselves; but sure by how much the more they hear of it abroad, by so much the more reason have they to lay it to heart, and to consider whether that great growth of fects and errors in the Church, under which it so much groaneth at this day, have not occasionally, at the least and in part, grown out of that liberty, & those principles for latitude and difformity as well in practice as in judgement, which our Brethren of the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Brethren. 107 Brethren so much plead for and allow unto themselves; but for our mentioning it in this Paper, we thinke it very sea-sonable and sutable to the matter for which we alleadge it, not with any desire of opposition, or to turne it against our Brethren as their phrase is, but out of a syncere zeal to the peace of Gods Church, and to the preventing of unnecessary teparation, which we cannot but thinke would in time prove the occasion of schismes and errors against which we have covenanted.

They tell us, That this argument cannot hold against them without affixing an interpretation upon that part of the Covenant, according to our own principles only, to the prejudice of theirs.

Our proposition was never intended for an argument against them, but for a meanes of accommodation between them and us; and that reason and argument which is in them, is not drawn from any private interpretation of the Covenant (which we dare not assume the liberty to assix thereunto, however our Brethren would infinuate the contrary) but from the words themselves; the words are, that we will endeavor the nearest conjunction and uniformity; now we thinke from the immediate and grammaticall sense of our reason doth appear: That since we have covenanted to endeavor the nearest conjunction and uniformity, therefore in those things wherein we professe to be of one minde and judgement, that conjunction should be practically preserved.

They adde, When we tooke this Nationall Covenant, we were known to be of the same principles we now are of; and yet this Covenant was professedly so attempered in their first framing of it, as that we of different judgements might take it, both parties being present at the framing of it in Scotland.

We know not how far their principles were then known, they might have been much better known would they have

O000 2

givou

They further adde; If this should be the way of urging, it - is as free for us to give our interpretation of the latitude or nearnesse of uniformity intended, as for our Brethren, we having been present at the debates of the Assembly about it, and well know and remember the sense which was there held forth - thereof.

Brethrens principles, least it be interpreted as done contrary to the professed temper of the Covenant, and consequently to the scope of it? These to us are strange inti-

mations, in Aller ince

For our parts, as we think it not free either for us or them or any private person, to make interpretations of the Covenant, fo we deny that we have done it; we have argued from the very words themselves, and so we all must do, or 1137

else

of the A sembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Brethren.

else we can make no use of it: As for the sense held forth in the Assembly, which our Brethren so well know & remember, we remember indeed that the Assembly gave their sense by vote touching Prelacy, which was after inserted into the body of the article; but for other particulars concerning which no vote passed, this we know that no Member of the Assembly could give any other sense but their owne as single persons, nothing being the sense of the Assembly, but what appears to be so by their order or resolve; and that if one speak any thing as his sense, the rest being silent, their silence is not to be taken for a consent.

They tell us, That further when the Assembly was appointed by an order of the Honourable House of Commons bearing date Sept. the 15. 1643. to set forth in a Declaration the grounds that have induced the A Sembly to give their opinions that this Covenant may be taken in point of conscience; accordingly some of them were by a Committee entrusted to bring in materials to that purpose, and accordingly did, which materials were committed to one of them by a Sub-committee to draw up, and among many other things, that which followes as grounds of taking the Covenant, as touching that first article; that we shall

endeavor &c.

What ever was done by one or more of these Brethren by way of comment upon the Covenant or any article thereof, was not done according to the forementioned order, feeing it requires onely a declaration of the grounds upon which the Assembly gave their opinion concerning the lawfulnesse oftaking the Covenant, not an explication of what private men conceived to be the meaning of it; and furely that which is here obtruded as the fense, and the onely sense in which these Brethren judge it lawfull, never passed the vote, never was so much as debated in the Assembly, and therefore cannot possibly come within the compasse of those grounds which the Order relates to; but that which we wonder most at, is that our Brethren should a little before

0000 3

charge

## 110 The answer of the Sub-committee of the Divines

charge us without cause (ashath been shewed) of a crime, and should presently fall into the same themselves; for what is, if this benot, to affix an interpretation upon the Covenant sutable to the principles of one partie, and exclusive to those of another? but we proceed to the explication it selfe.

This endeavor (say they) in our places and callings for uniformity, we apprehended the meaning of it to be, that as in our ranks and stations we should endeavor it, so according to those generall warrants of the word to regulate such an endeavor in the use of meanes whereby to accomplish it; and therefore as for the pattern, the word of God is to be in our eye, so for the way and meanes and progresse in reducing the Churches to such anuniformity, such rules are to be observed as the nature of such a work will beare, and which the Apostles who had infallibility, observed in reducing the Jews and those of the Circumcision, and the Gentiles to an uniformity, and without tyranny or pressing mens consciences beyond the severall degrees of light, which God vouchsafes to severall Churches more

or leste, &c.

Our Brethren here give us such an explication of uniformity, as indeed may fuite to any the most difformous Churches that are, who will all tell us that they propose to themselves the right patterne, rules and examples, and from thence are instructed unto difformity with others; it is not an uniformity of endeavour which we are bound only unto, but to endeavour an uniformity in the particulars expressed, namely as in Doctrine and Worship, so in forme of Church-government: We all most readily agree that the word of God is the rule in all respects for reformation, and the Apostles examples to be followed in all things of perpetuall equity; but doth not the word of God presse upon us unity of judgement and practice, to be of one minde, of one accord, not to sause divisions and offences contrary to the Doctrine which we have learned? tospeake the same things, to be perfectly joyned togeof the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Brethren. 111 together in the same judgement, that there be no divisions amongst ms. 2 Cor. 13.11. Phil. 2.1, 2. Rom. 16.17. 1 Cor. 1.10. Or did the Apostles ever endeavour such an uniformity, or so much as call it so, as was nothing else but a doing every man according to his own light, or to use the phrase of the Old Testament, that which is right in his own eyes? did they not suppresse the contentions of men by the custome of the Churches of God, 1 (or. 11.16. and ordaine the same practice in all the Churches, notwithstanding our Brethrens distinction of difference of light? I Cor. 7.17. For the case which our Brethren mention of reducing those of the

not thereunto brought by a Synodical determination? A. 15. And did not the Apostles binde the burden of some necessary things on the Churches, albeit there were in those

circumcision and the Gentiles to an uniformity, were they

Churches graduall differences of light?

We could be glad our Brethren had explained themselves when they speak of Tyranny and pressing mens consciences, because under that pretence many oppose all kinde of Government, and many most injuriously represent Presbyteriall Government as formidable and tyrannicall; our Brethren in their way exercise the same kinde of power, and that with more rigour; the relief which the law of nature allows to appeal from an unjust sentence, to a power which may correct it, they deny; Christian Professors, though neither ignorant nor scandalous, they shut the doore against, and keep out of communion; They do doctrinally and practically condemn all Churches which are not Independent, refusing all membership and ordinary communion in them, and may according to their principles assume a power to inflict the heavy sentence of Non-communion upon them, when they see occasion as a punishment to reclaime them. Lastly we suppose our Brethren will grant these two things, il That a Member of a particular Congregation may be excommunicated for Heresie or Schisme. 2. That the Officers of severall Churches may convene, and pronounce a sentence of Non-communion upon other Churches; surely except our Brethren resolve to tolerate all Sects and Heressies whatsoever, they also may soon lie under the charge and odium of tyranny.

They proceed and tell us; Although there be one pattern in our eye in common, which all our consciences swear to bring. all to; yet de facto, and in the providence of God it so talles out in the reforming of Churches (now after Antichristianisme hath overspread and corrupted all) that the light grows every age more and more to the perfect day, and the comming of Christ, who is to melt that man of sin by the increasing bright nesse of his commings, and so both of persons and Churches; some see more some see lesse, as me see in the reformed Churches at this day. and will certainly fall out thus in these of ours; now therefore in this case the rule for effecting uniformity must certainly be no other then what the Apostle gives, Phil. 2. As farre as we have attained let us walke by the same rule; And therefore the way is to see how farre we have attained, and set downe wherein we agree, (as in all substantials of Faith and Worship it is certain we shall) and so to walke by that as the same rule; and then in (uch matters wherein we are otherwise minded, to leave it to God, and such good means that God may reveale it to them in his time as his promife is. 2000 il ujulia.

We easily understand what our Brethren meane by the overspreading of Antichristianisme, and how they do tacitly charge all who dissent from them with no meaner a guilt; and they tell us of the increase of light, which must melt the man of sinne; if our Brethren meane by Antichrist or the man of sinne that which the reformed Churches have generally understood, namely, the Papacy, we do not think but that in the great differences between them and us, the light already revealed is clear and sufficient enough for conviction, and manifesting of the errors thereof; and we believe if our Brethren were imployed in that conslict, not-with-

withstanding they appropriate the increase of light unto their way at this time, yet they would not use any more convincing weapons against the man of sin then the Champions of the reformed Churches both in these and other Kingdomes have formerly used; we shall not at this time curiously examine whether the Apostle by impaired this maproias, which they render the increasing brightnesse of his comming ( we know not upon what either ground or authority) meane the light of the Gospell, or the second comming of Christ to judgment, or some other notable manifestation of Christs presence in wayes of power and justice & shaking the earth; but let us admit what our Brethren say, that Antichristianisme is to be melted away by a growing light, doth any such growing light appear at this time? we confesse there is great crying up of new lights; but under that notion do not old and decried errors of Anabaptisme, Antinomianisme, Brownisme, yea Arrianisme and Photinianisme break forth to the great scandall of the Church? surely the new lights we now hear of in the most places are no other in the Church then a Comet in the heavens, which doth onely illighten men to foresee calamities; whatever this light is, must it not increase in the next age as well as in this? and must that new light then melt away the Antichristianisme of Independency as that doth in this age the Antichristianisme of Presbytery? and shall Government in every age be changed according to differences of light? have not our Brethren found out a Jus Divinum for their way in Scripture? We so understand them; and must some increasing brightnesse hereafter abolish that? to us such principles tend to very Scepticisme and to a floating suspence and continuall uncertainty and unperswasion of judgement.

We heartily embrace the rule which our Brethren give us out of the Apostle, Phil. 3. 15, 16. and desire to walke by it; but did the Apostle ever intend out of that place to allow Brethren who agree in all substantials of Faith and

Pppp

Worship

Worship to separate from one another, & to deny Fellowship and Communion with one another even in those very substantials wherein they agree? is this to walke by the same rule, and to mind the same things, to separate from Churches. in those very things wherein we agree with them? or shall every circumstantiall difference be a sufficient ground to withdraw Communion totally and to all purposes? When there were differences of judgement amongst the Corinthians and Romans, did not the Apostle write to them as one Church, as one body? did he ever suppose that a few differences should be sufficient grounds for exstinguishing the mutuall relation of Membership which they had in those Churches? Besides, may not the Magistrate out of a care to preserve the Churches which are under his Government and protection, in unity, and free from schismes and divifions, allow one way of Government, and disallow another, as they have done in the case of the Liturgy and Directory, and in the case of Episcopacy and Presbytery, without referving a falvo for fuch as shall in judgement differ from the alteration which they have made? or must Episcopall men be indulged separated Dioceses wherein to worship God and enjoy ordinances sutably to such principles as they hold, distinctly from the Churches under another rule? surely if our Brethrens principles extend to such a latitude for other mens judgements as well as for their own, which we know no reason why they should not, they put them in a fitter temper to covenant multiformity then. uniformity.

They go on, But if an uniformity for uniformities sake, (and so the argument of our Brethren here runnes) that is, affecting uniformity so much as not to regard mens consciences, should be pressed and urged by such meanes as formerly, without respect had to the variety of light in matters of a lesser nature, this were beyond the callings and warrants of the word, and will prove a perfect tyranny; and will be so farre from being a meanes

of the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Brethren. 115
of love, which is aimed at, that it will lay the foundation of
confision and dissension as formerly it did: It is with Churches
as with men, and particular Saints, they are of severall Sizes
and growth, of severall statures; and as men are left to be more
or lesse holy, as God by good meanes shall make them, so must
Churches; as it were against nature to stretch a low man to the
same length with a taller, or to cut a tall man to the stature of
one which is low, for uniformities sake, so to bring both
more growne or more Refermed Churches to a middle
stature for compliance with others for meer uniformities
sake.

We know not what our Brethren meane by uniformity for uniformities suke; we think they asperse us in such expressions as if we laid grounds for tyranny, or intended not to respect the consciences of men; we desire uniformity for order, and order for edification; we desire it as is expressed in the letter of the Covenant, by which our Brethren are

bound as well as we.

But they say to desire it without respect to variety of light in lesser matters &c. Certainly separation is not either in natura rei or in the consequences of it so small a thing as our Brethren make it; but we wonder our Brethren should mention variety of light here so often, when it is p'ain that the mention we make of uniformity covenanted, was in order unto their Communion with us in those things onely wherein they and we have an unity of light, Viz. in the substantials of Faith and Worship, wherein we desire no more of them then we are confident was practifed by the Saints at Philippi, to whom the Apostle directs that rule our Brethren make mention of, namely, to hold practicall Communion in things wherein they doctrinally agree; certainly this can never prove a perfect tyranny; though for ought we perceive, any thing which is one must be judged the foundation of tyranny; but to touch that point of variety of light, we desire our Brethren to answer us in this

Pppp 2

116 of the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Brethren.

one thing, whether some must be denied the liberty of their conscience in matter of practice, or none? if none, then we must all renounce our Covenant, and let in Prelacy again, and all others wayes; if a denial of liberty unto some may be just, then uniformity may be settled notwithstanding variety of lights, without any tyranny at all.

We acknowledge degrees of light and growth amongst men, and do not affirme that some must be kept under for conformities take with those who are worse then themfelves; or that all matters of difference in judgement must be authoritatively decided for uniformitie sake; yet hence it doth not follow but that as one confession of Faith and one Directory for Worship, so also one forme of Government and constitution of Churches may be settled; for we are sure that in this generall our Brethren agree with us, that one way for the substance of it is necessary for all, though touching the particulars we are at difference; and the onenesse of the way (if it be right) can be no hinderance to Christian growth, nor the diversities of growth unto it; are not Christians of severall stature in France, Holland, Scotland, where the Government is but one? may not Churches differ in light and agree in Government?

They say, As men are lest to be more or lesse holy, as God by good means shall make them, so are Churches; must men be lest to themselves to be more or lesse holy as they please, under no discipline to surther holinesse in them? if nor, what argument can our Brethren draw from such a proposition between men and Churches? we embrace the proportion, and from thence argue, as men though of different growth in light, ought not to be Independent and exempt from Government, so neither particular Churches; and as men thus differing may be under one uniforme Government, so also

may Churches.

For our Brethrens similitude of low men and tall men, though

though it be pretty and plausible, yet our Brethren know fuch are but popular and inartificiall arguments, which have more of flourish then of substance in them; for would our Brethren apply this argument against endeavouring to bring low and middle statur'd Churches to a more growne & more reformed condition, because a low body is not to be ftretched to the stature of a taller? why then do they so much endeavour to gather Churches out of ours unto themselves? or if the Magistrate should thinke fit to settle their way by a law, would they allow a Toleration to Episcopacy, Presbytery, Brownisme, Erastianisme, orany other Government excogitable by the fancies of men upon this reason, because men must not for uniformities sake be pared or stretched to the measure of other men? would they endure the lower suckers at the roote of their tree to grow till they had killed the tree it selfe? Ad populum phaleras. But since they will use such kind of arguments, we must needs learn of them who is the low man, and who the tall, least the low man be cut yet shorter by uniformity, or the tall man stretched taller; though they know without stretching or cutting, long and short timber may be imployed in one and the same building, and tall men and little children be Members of one and the same family without separating from one another; but did the Apostles and Elders of Ferusalem cut tall men and stretch low men when they ordered necessary things for mutuall peace? we will not envy our Brethren their talnesse, we will desire to be low in our own eyes as well as we are in theirs, we confesse our day is but the day of small things, yet we hope it is a time of love; far be it from us to fay we are rich and stand in need of nothing; yet we hope when Presbyterian Government is up, we shall labour both by our Ministry and Discipline to present our Members blamelesse before Christ. Our Brethren have nothing but what they have received; and time was when he who was taller then all his Brethren by the head was laid aside, and alow Pppp 3

a low and lowly person came in his roome.

It followes in our Brethrens Paper; And this suites as with the rules of the word, so with the scope of the article; for look what kinde of uniformity in confession of Faith, the like in matter of Worship and Government is to be intended; and that the rather because directions for Government and Worship are the more remote from all Christians knowledge, and perhaps more obscure in the word, and are the special controversies of the times; now as in matters of Faith you would not for uniformities sake determine all differences in judgement, but fundamentals, and an uniformity therein is all intended; so by analogie in point of Worship and Government. And secondly, The end is that God may dwell amongst us, who is the Anthor of peace and not of confusion in all the Churches, which peace (whilst in his providence mens judgements do and will differ)

will never be attained by a rigid uniformity.

We alledged uniformity covenanted for this end that in those things wherein we agree doctrinally we might agree practically, and not separate as to those purposes; and our Brethren throughout this Paper dispute against it which respect to variety of lights; surely they will not easily perswade us, or (we think) any indifferent man to beleeve that it was not the scope of the Covenant that where there was unity in judgement, there should be at least so farre forth uniformity in practice and communion; furely if the Covenant intend but one confession of Faith and one directory for Worship, we cannot see how our Brethren can make the scope of it to favor diverse wayes of discipline and Church-government; but taking all pro concesso, we further answer, that as in matters of Faith we do not for uniformities sake determine all differences in judgement but fundamentals; so when all do agree in fundamentals, if any should for some small differences in judgement separate from Communion with true Churches, we should think that those men did sinne against that unity which ought to be amongst

Chri-

of the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Brethren. 119

Christians so fundamentally agreeing; in like manner, though in matters of Government being more obscure and remote from Christian knowledge, difference of judgment, & haply in some things of practice also, may be allowed, yet when in the most things and those most substantiall, there is an agreement, for Brethren upon smaller differences not to content themselves with such expedients as may be provided to reconcile those differences, but to separate from Communion with true Churches of Christ, we cannot but beleeve it to be contrary to the word of God and to the Scope and Letter of the Covenant; and we would willingly understand from our Brethren what disjunction or difformity is contrary to the Covenant, if this be not, to have divided practice and separated Communion even in those things wherein men have united judgements, or when the peace of the Church is likely to be preserved, if men will not keep Communion with one another no not in those things wherein they do doctrinally agree; for our Brethren do all along infilt upon a wrong ground, namely, difference of judgement, when in our proposition the uniformity mentioned is evidently restricted unto unity of judgment.

Our Brethren conclude this long Paragraph thus; But this order of the Honourable House of Commons so necessary for the satisfaction of all differing judgements, as at first, to take the Covenant, so to continue stedfast therein, and which would in all likelihood have laid a foundation of ending this and

other differences, was superseded to this day.

That there was an order and superseded, we acknowledge; but that it was intended for the satisfaction of different judgments we deny; it is but their presumption so to affirme; the use these Brethren made of it was upon pretence of such a declaration to have given in their private sense of the Covenant, which they very much contended for, and the Committee of the Assembly together with the Commissional sense.

fioners

120 The Answer of the Sub-committee of the Divines

stive and inconsistent with the end of the Cove-

jant.

For the superseding of it, we give this account; 1. Whereas other orders from the Honourable House were wont to be fent by Members of their own, this was given by one of the under Clarks to one of the Messengers, who brought it to the Scribe of the Assembly after it had lien in the office many dayes. 2. Upon debate it was found that these Brethren, (whose great care to secure their own principles, and long travell to be delivered of that private sense, which themselves had conceived, were sufficiently known) laboured to turne it to a wrong use for their private interest and advantage, as appeared by many circumstances, and in this especially, That one of them though he was in Scotland, or in his journey from thence, and not at the Assembly when they debated and resolved the Case of Conscience touching the Covenant, would yet undertake to set down the reasons which moved the Assembly to judge the Covenant lawfull to be taken in point of Conscience. 3. It was the advice and counsell of some Eminent Members of the Honourable House of Commons, who were of the Committee from the House to joyne with the Divines of the Assembly, and the Commissioners from Scotland, about the businesse, that this order should not be proceeded upon without further direction from the House 4. There was an Ordinance of Parliament bearing Date Feb. 2. 1643. wherein among other things it was ordained Art. 10. That for the better encouragement of all sorts of persons to take the Covenant, it be recommended to the Assembly of Divines to make a breif Declaration by way of Exhortation to all sorts of persons to take it, as that which they judge not onely lawfull, but (all things considered) exceeding expedient and necessary for all that wish well to Religion, the King and Kingdome to joyn in, and to be a fingular pledg of Gods gracious goodnesse to all the three

of the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Brethren. 121

three Kingdomes. And in Art. 14. It is again remembred, That the Assembly of Divines do prepare an exhortation for the better taking of the Covenant, in obedience whereunto the Assembly did draw up such an exhortation to satisfie the consciences of men for the taking of it; which exhortation being sent to, and read in the House of Commons, they made this order upon it, viz. Die Veneris 9. Febr. 1643. An exhortation touching the taking of the Solemne League and Covenant, and for satisfying of such scruples as may arise in the taking of it, was this day read the first and second time, and by Vote upon the question assended unto, and ordered to be fortwith printed; So that in obeying that latter Ordinance we conceive that both that and the former Order of sept. 15. then soregoing, and now insisted so much upon by our

Brethren, were fully fatisfied.

Our Brethren conclude thus; 2. We answer that we willingly againe do prof. Set bat in the Substance of Worship and Do-Etrine we are one and of the same judgement with our Brethren. pet to practice and enjoy those parts of Worship as ordinances of a Church, there is ( as to our consciences) necessarily required as th: seate and subject of Worship and other Ordinances, a Churh State, and those such Churches as where we may be Members, and joyn in Communion therein as Members without sin, which we cannot do as we have all along professed; and such Churches as wherein we can enjoy all Ordinances, which is denied us here in this Paragraph, So that the only way left to reduce us to an uniformity and conjunction in the same practices, is to allow us such distinct Churches from yours according to our principles, in which, and by means of which we shall hold all possible Communion and Conformity with yours, whereas otherwise we shall only retaine an uniformity in judgement, whereas that uniformity the Covenant much rather obligeth you and us all unto, is, that which may be an uniformity in practice, with fatisfaction to all mens consciences and their edification.

Upon their professed unity with usin judgement our de-

fire was they might continue Communion and Membership with us in those things wherein they so agree; here they answer, No, they cannot do it without sinne, and intimate two reasons of it, I. Because to practise and enjoy those parts of Worship as Ordinances of a Church, there is necessarily required as the seate and subject of Worship and other Ordinances, a Church State. 2. Those Churches must be such, as wherein they may enjoy all Ordinances, which is denied them, they far, here, 1. This to us voids their occasionall Communion quite, for can they occasionally practice and enjoy Worship and Ordinances out of the seate and subject of that Worship and Ordinances? or, when they preach and pray with our Churches, do they not dispence those Ordinances to our peopleas to Churches of Christ who come unto the Ordinances as in their proper seate to be edified and comforted by them? 2. They tell us not what their Church State is which they make the seate of Ordinances, and which we want, and confequently enjoy Ordinances out of their right scate; They acknowledge us true Churches of Christ, have not true Churches the State of Churches? are not true Churches the seate and subject of Worship?

But they fay, They must be where they may enjoy all Ordinances, which here is denied them; 1. We know not any Ordinance which will be denied them in our Congregations. 2. Have they all Ordinances in their own Churches? do not they hold Ruling Elders to be an Ordinance? have all their Churches Ruling Elders? or may they be in their own Churches without some one Ordinance, and not in ours? if they should think anointing of the sick with oyle, or washing of feet be an Ordinance, will they be no Members where they cannot enjoy these? To determine controversies of Faith and cases of Conscience judicially, is an Ordinance; if they be of no Church but where that is exercised, and the liberty of opinions judicially restrained, their Churches would foone be dissolved, and they would finde it we believe difficult to gather more. As

of the Assembly, to the Reply of the Dissenting Brethren. 123

As for their own expedient for uniformity and conjuction with which they conclude, namely, to allow them distinct Churches according to their own principles, we look upon it but as a riddle, and wonder how disjunction can be an only way of conjunction, & multiformity of uniformity, & separation of communion, and different principles and practices of conformity; what Churches under Heaven may we not hold conjunction, uniformity, communion with upon such termes?

They say, They agree with us in judgement, but will not joyn in practice, but perswade us, that not joyning in practice is the best, the only meanes to attaine unto that practicall uniformity which the Covenant principally intends, and close all up with this glosse upon uniformity in practice, That it must be with satisfaction to all mens consciences and their edification; This to us sounds as if they did not onely desire liberty of Conscience for themselves, but for all men, and would have us beleeve that this is all the uniformity which the Covenant requires, that we should endeavor to bring the Churches of God in the three Kingdomes to the nearest conjunction and uniformity, yet so as that we may leave all men to the liberty of their consciences; we hope our Brethren have some other meaning, yet at present these their expressions savor so much of such a sense, that we cannot understand what they do meane lesse then this; and whether that be the sense of the Covenant, we humbly leave together with this whole Paper unto the consideration of this Honourable Committee.

After the delivery of this Paper, the Committee of Lords and Commons, and Assembly of Divines adjourned to a day, but being diverted by other occasions, have not since had any meeting, and so there was no further proceeding in that business.

The state of the s A CONTRACTOR WAS A TOTAL OF THE PARTY OF THE the commence of the contract o The state of the suffer will be the suffer of THE REPORT OF THE PARTY OF THE police with a resemble of striver method of the letter A state of the first of the state of the sta of the contract of the state of the state of the state of to each distribute the column percent receptable es Alexandre de la company de la company





